

By Mr. HAMILL: Petition of Rotary Club of Jersey City, N. J., to change the name of the Panama Canal to the Roosevelt Canal; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany House bill 15136, granting a pension to Leonard Walker, guardian of Flora Wall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: Petition of Engineers' Club, of Trenton, N. J., favoring the enactment of legislation which will continue control and operation of the wire systems by the Government until Congress shall have studied the question and determined upon a proper and safe procedure to be followed when they are returned to private ownership; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of traffic and transportation bureau, Tacoma Commercial Club, and Chamber of Commerce, Tacoma, Wash., favoring the revival and restoration to the Interstate Commerce Commission of certain powers taken away or suspended by the Federal control act approved March 21, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Chamber of Commerce, Oneida, N. Y., urging continuation of Federal control over lines of communication until Congress has time to determine upon permanent policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEELY: Petition of Royal Window Glass Co., Grafton, W. Va., urging that pending tax bill be kept down to \$4,000,000,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Bank of Mount Hope, W. Va., urging that new tax bill be kept down to \$4,000,000,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Bank of Fairmont, W. Va., urging that the tax bill be kept down to \$4,000,000,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of officers of Lodge No. 326, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers and Iron Shipbuilders, Grafton, W. Va., urging Government control of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POLK: Petition of Wilmington Clearing House Association and members of savings banks relative to forthcoming liberty loan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Farmers' Institute, held at Selbyville, Del., endorsing plan for league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Manufacturers' Association of Wilmington, Del., relative to revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WASON: Resolutions adopted at a regular meeting of the Manchester, N. H., Council, No. 195, of the Order of United Commercial Travelers of America, favoring the return of the railroads of the United States to their original owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions adopted by the New Hampshire State Federation of Labor, favoring the enactment of a law which will bring about Government ownership of railways; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 30, 1919.

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 28, 1919.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Henderson	Nugent	Spencer
Brandegee	Hitchcock	Overman	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Johnson, Cal.	Penrose	Swanson
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Pollock	Thomas
Curtis	Knox	Ransdell	Thompson
Fernald	La Follette	Robinson	Trammell
Fletcher	Lenroot	Saulsbury	Vardaman
France	McKellar	Shafroth	Wadsworth
Gay	McNary	Sheppard	Walsh
Gerry	Martin, Va.	Simmons	Wolcott
Hale	Nelson	Smoot	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. FREELINGHUYSEN, Mr. KIRBY, Mr. NEW, Mr. POINDEXTER, Mr.

SHERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Arizona, Mr. STERLING, and Mr. WOLCOTT answered to their names when called.

Mr. POLLOCK. I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] on account of illness. I should like to have this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. McKELLAR. I announce the absence of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] on account of illness.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] is absent owing to illness.

Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. KING, Mr. HARDWICK, Mr. WARREN, Mr. MARTIN of Kentucky, and Mr. POMERENE entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] is detained by illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-six Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

### RESPONSE OF SOVIET GOVERNMENT OF RUSSIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, yesterday, in the course of my remarks, I was asked by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] if a certain response that had been made by the Soviet government of Russia had been put in the Record or was intended to be put in the Record by me. I responded then that I did not have such a response. This morning the Senator from Colorado has handed to me the response to which he then referred, and because of his suggestion yesterday and his request that it be put in the Record, I ask that it be printed without reading in the Record this morning.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The all-Russian congress of Soviets expresses its appreciation to the American people, and first of all to the laboring and exploited classes in the United States for the message sent by the President of the United States to the congress of the Soviets in this time when the Russian socialist Soviet republic is living through most difficult trials.

The Russian republic uses the occasion of the message from President Wilson to express to all peoples who are dying and suffering from the horrors of this imperialistic war its warm sympathy and firm conviction that the happy time is near when the laboring masses in all bourgeois countries will throw off the capitalist yoke and establish a socialist state of society, which is the only one capable of assuring a permanent and just peace as well as the culture and well-being of all who toil.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 5354) extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Delaware River, authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Co., or their successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River, approved the 24th day of August, 1912."

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11984) to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses; recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 12 to the bill and agrees to the same with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; further insists upon its disagreement to the remainder of the amendments; requests a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HOUSTON, Mr. ASWELL, and Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 15140) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GERRY presented a petition signed by sundry citizens of Newport, R. I., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the national ownership and Government operation of all railroads in the United States necessary for the furnishing of transportation to the people of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. THOMPSON. I present petitions in the form of telegrams pertaining to good-roads legislation, one from the Kansas Editorial Association in convention at Topeka, another from the Kansas Good Roads Association, and another telegram from the governor of Kansas, transmitting information relative to the action of the Kansas Legislature. The telegram from the governor of Kansas is very short, and I should like to have it printed in the Record.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. On what subject are the telegrams?

Mr. THOMPSON. On good-roads legislation and the action of the Kansas Legislature in regard thereto. I only ask to have printed in the Record the telegram from the governor of the State, transmitting the action of the legislature and requesting Federal legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. To the telegram transmitting the action of the legislature, I raise no objection, but to the printing of the other telegrams I object.

Mr. THOMPSON. I should like to have them noted. I do not ask to have them printed in the Record.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. They can be noted by a presentation for reference.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is all I have asked.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. All right.

Mr. THOMPSON. I ask that the telegram from the governor of Kansas be printed in the Record and, with the other two telegrams, referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

There being no objection, the telegrams were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and the one from the governor ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Telegram.]

TOPEKA, KANS., January 29, 1919.

HON. WILLIAM H. THOMPSON,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Kansas Legislature to-day adopted resolution requesting Congress to pass bill granting additional Federal aid for construction of highways. This is vital to the plans for immediate employment of returning soldiers.

HENRY J. ALLEN, Governor.

Mr. LODGE presented a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Labor of Lynn, Mass., and a resolution adopted by the City Council of Peabody, Mass., favoring the granting of six months' pay to honorably discharged soldiers and sailors, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of the Federation of Labor of Detroit, Mich., praying for the establishment of a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of St. Clair County, Mich., praying for the proposed extension of Federal control of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of the Maine State Poultry Association, praying for an appropriation to carry out the poultry extension work by the Bureau of Animal Industry, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WARREN presented a resolution adopted by Local Union No. 950, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, of Cheyenne, Wyo., favoring Government ownership of railroads and other public utilities, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

#### ST. CROIX AND CHIPPEWA INDIANS.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4699) for the relief of the St. Croix and Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 672) thereon.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 5480) to increase the cost of the public building at Park City, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 5481) granting a pension to William E. Hughes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 5482) providing for the refund of taxes collected for stamp tax on certain policies under the emergency-tax act of October 22, 1914, under the proviso to which act such policies were exempt; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 5483) granting an increase of pension to James Rowland; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 5484) to authorize the commissioning of Maj. Robert W. Barr (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### AMENDMENT TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. JONES of Washington submitted an amendment authorizing the Indian tribes and individual Indians residing in the State of Washington and west of the summit of the Cascade Mountains to submit to the Court of Claims certain claims growing out of treaties and otherwise, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PENROSE submitted an amendment proposing that the officers and members of the fire department of the District of Columbia be divided into two bodies or platoons by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, which shall be designated as a day force and a night force, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 15140. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### VALIDATION OF WAR CONTRACTS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I must say that hereafter I shall request that the Senate proceed with the regular order.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13274) to provide relief where formal contracts have not been made in the manner required by law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK].

Mr. KIRBY. The Committee on Military Affairs had this bill under consideration for some time. It had the views of the War Department about it; it had the views of the different chambers of commerce and boards of trade of the great cities of the country; it had the views of their legal departments about the effect and scope of the bill.

The subcommittee reported the bill as insisted upon by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], and so far as I know that bill was considered and reported by the full committee without taking into consideration the views of either the contractors, who were supposed to be given a remedy, or the War Department, which had authority or was to be given authority to settle these matters. At least, there was no statement—

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I merely wish to correct the Senator. I know he does not want to present the matter in any other than the true way. The committee heard representatives of the War Department and representatives of the contractors.

Mr. KIRBY. The statement of their views was not referred to the entire committee with the bill, so far as I know, and that is the reason I made the statement.

But coming down to the main proposition, and we had just as well face this matter and get through with it, I wish to say just a few words. These informal and defective contracts it is urged ought to be validated, that the men who made the contracts and did the work and expended money in compliance with them are not at fault and ought to be compensated. They are, however, asking for an additional and a better remedy than is vouchsafed under existing law to men who had valid contracts and whose contracts were canceled because the Government could not use the munitions and supplies that had been ordered and contracted for after the armistice. Those men who had valid contracts and whose contracts have been canceled because of the armistice having been signed must resort to the regional boards which have already been constructed. The claim comes through the regional board to a central board that has been established in the War Department here, then through the hands of the Secretary of War and then to the Court of Claims if the parties are not satisfied with the award made. These men came and said, "We want a remedy here, for the validation of our contracts; we must be provided a remedy, we have none whatever; our contracts are invalid or informal or have not been completed, and we have expended our efforts and expended our money and we are entitled to compensation."

The bill as reported by the subcommittee, insisted upon by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], provides, as the other bill proposed by the committee does, that only when he regards that the public interest requires it the Secretary of War shall validate the contract.

The first bill introduced did not provide that on a quantum meruit a man might recover who had no contract at all, who had been ordered to produce certain stuff, and had, in fact, expended money in producing it.

The bill as proposed here provides that both the men whose contracts were valid and have been canceled and those who claim rights under informal contracts may have the benefit of this additional board, this commission of appeals or board established down here, to pass on these claims. They all may have that, as I understand it. The claim goes through the regional board, composed of the best men in the district—busi-



ness men; it goes through the central board already created in the operation of the War Department; and it goes to the Secretary of War for a final determination, and then it will go to this new board proposed to be created in the Chamberlain bill, and from there, if the parties are not satisfied, it can be taken to the Court of Claims.

That certainly is providing enough machinery and a sufficient remedy for any man who has no valid contract to start with. This has been done in order that the matter may be handled expeditiously.

It is objected that the War Department ought not to be permitted to settle these matters, because it was through its fault that the contracts were not legally made in the first instance. That may or may not be true. The contracts certainly were not made through any intentional mistake of the War Department nor were they invalid on that account. It may be that there was not time enough to prepare and properly execute the contracts, and certainly the orders have not been regarded as executed contracts and could not be, the parties not having had time to reduce the terms of the contracts to proper form, the speedy delivery of the things that were necessary being insisted upon.

The War Department, under the law as it is, settles for the Government all the claims for compensation and damages under canceled valid contracts until there is some additional legislation provided. Why should not the War Department have also been permitted to settle with the contractors who have invalid and informal claims, as it is allowed to settle all of the claims under canceled valid contracts. The War Department is familiar with the whole transaction from its beginning to its completion, and has the machinery arranged for the settlement of such claims; but it is contended that in the settlement of claims arising out of these informal illegal contracts the War Department might be overreached or that some man in the War Department might be in collusion with the contractors and claimants. Certainly the very same objection would apply to settlement of claims under other contracts.

But grant that is an objection which is to be considered. We have had to trust the War Department for the making of previous contracts; we have trusted the War Department for the cancellation of valid contracts; and we, under the law, must trust the War Department for the settlement of claims for damages under valid contracts, subject only to appeal to the Court of Claims.

Now, the contractors who have these invalid contracts want an additional remedy over the remedy which was provided even for the settlement of valid contracts or claims thereunder. They say, "We distrust the War Department; we do not believe that they will do justice." But they do not distrust the War Department for the same reason which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hitchcock] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] do. They, the contractors, distrust the War Department for fear that the War Department will do its duty by the Government too strictly and will allow them too small a margin on their claims. They say, "We want this additional court here," and their attorneys and the representatives of the 6,000 contractors say that they believe this constitutes a fair tribunal for the adjustment of differences that must necessarily arise under the conditions which now exist, and that they believe it will act speedily and give them that measure of relief which they ought to have. That is their understanding.

The War Department believe that under the system provided and proposed in the bill reported by the majority of the committee they can get these matters settled within a reasonable time, and if there is any complaint of favoritism shown by the War Department, or if there is any complaint of anything having been done wrong or by collusion with the War Department, that can be objected to and appealed to the commission that is proposed to be created. After the case has gone to the commission, if the claimants are not satisfied with the award that is made, they can then appeal to the Court of Claims. There is that much machinery to take care of the men who had not valid contracts in the first instance, and this is but an additional commission of claims that is created in order that they may have absolutely a fair deal, and they can not complain that they have not been fairly treated, that they have been paid too little, or their rights have been disregarded by the War Department.

Now, let us see whether or not there is necessity for it. The Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Tennessee say that there ought to be a new and entirely different system; that their commission of claims should investigate the conditions by agencies established by the commission—regional boards here, there, and yonder—and then let all of the cases go to the commission of claims, let them all be settled in that way, and

that then the Government will be fairly treated and the contractors protected. Let us see what will be the effect of that.

Mr. President, there are 6,000 contracts which it is proposed to validate, which it is proposed to recognize as obligations upon the part of the Government, perhaps. In any event there will be 6,000 claims which necessarily will arise for compensation under these contracts. Under the Hitchcock bill as proposed they will go to this commission, and the argument of the Senator from Nebraska about the operation of the commission created by his bill is that the cases will go to the commission already passed upon by all of the agencies of the War Department, with a report stating whether they approve or disapprove of any particular thing. His idea seems to be that the commission will go into an examination of these matters, pass upon the justice of the award, and that there can then be no question but that the contractors and the Government will both be protected.

What will be the effect of it? Six thousand claims are to come before the proposed commission. The Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas consists of five judges, good lawyers, and most efficient in the transaction of the business coming before them, and yet that court can pass on—and does generally pass on—but 625 cases a year. In those cases transcripts are provided, and abstract of the testimony is made, showing just exactly what the claim is; the judgment of the lower court is filed, and the briefs of the attorneys, and yet it takes the Supreme Court of Arkansas—and I do not believe there is a more efficient court in the United States to-day—10 or 11 months to pass on and decide 625 cases and write the opinion therein. There are 6,000 cases here, and it will take the proposed commission—if they examine the cases that are brought before them—10 years to pass upon the justice of all the claims. At any rate, it can not be done, in my opinion, at all within less than six or seven years, if an examination is made such as would give the commissioners any idea of the fairness and justice of the claims.

That is the condition, I believe, that confronts the people who are asking for this remedy and who say that it is absolutely necessary not only to their own financial safety but to the prosperity of the country. A billion and a half of dollars are tied up in this kind of contracts in this kind of claims. It is provided in the bill that is proposed by the committee that, if the claimants are not satisfied with the award handed down by the commission of claims, they may appeal to the Court of Claims after being paid 75 per cent of the award. I do not believe they ought to be paid one cent of the award in case of appeal. I believe the Government ought to have a reasonable opportunity to settle these cases at what it believes is the right amount that ought to be paid under all the circumstances; but when it comes down to a settlement, if the Government says, "We will pay you so much," and the claimant says, "I ought to have so much more," and the Government says, "We will pay you that or you can go to the Court of Claims," then a man would take some little thought before he appealed to the Court of Claims, thus delaying the matter further. If he were offered a reasonably fair settlement he would settle, and the Government and himself would both be protected, and their interests promoted by the immediate settlement of the cases.

As to the Hitchcock bill, if there was ample time, I do not know that there would be any great objection to it. So far as I am concerned, I should like to see that court or commission stricken out of the bill entirely. It is said, "We ought not to let the War Department settle a claim where it has made the contract." Why not? They were authorized to make the contract in the first instance, and every officer is presumed to do his duty; then, why not let them settle it? If you and I have a contract in regard to a certain matter and I am to furnish you so much lumber and you come to me next week and say, "I do not want that lumber, I do not need it, I have changed my plans," and I say: "Yes; but you agreed to take it; here is your contract," and you say: "All right, I will not take the lumber, but I am going to pay you the damages; what are the damages?"

Then the two contracting parties get together and see if they can agree on the amount of damages. That has always been the practice; that is right, and it ought to be so, but every man must minimize his damages as much as he possibly can. That is the condition of the people who have made contracts with the Government. They, the War Department, say, "We are ready to negotiate with you about a settlement; we understand the whole thing." Then, under these circumstances, the bill proposes to provide a new commission that can hear these cases at some time in the near future and hope to conclude the consideration of them all without unreasonable delay.

It is provided that the commission proposed by the Hitchcock substitute shall enter upon the hearing of these claims, and I

say it will take it from six to seven years to finish them up if the commission learns enough about each claim to pass intelligent judgment upon it.

It does not make any difference to me whether one or the other measure is passed, except from the standpoint of promoting the public interest and of dealing fairly and justly with the men who have expended money and delivered material for the Government's benefit in a time of emergency. I believe they ought to be reimbursed, but I do not believe that under the Hitchcock bill it can be done in anything like time enough to save the contractors and promote the interests of the country.

#### LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. President, it is extremely unfortunate that the Congress of the United States should be called upon to consider legislation, such as that which is before the Senate, involving the payment of perhaps more than \$2,000,000,000 on so-called illegal or irregular contracts. That situation could not have arisen under normal conditions, and we would not to-day be called upon to consider a bill such as that which is now before the Senate had it been possible for the United States to have remained out of the great war which has shaken the whole world. Therefore, it may not be inappropriate at this time to submit some remarks on the general situation which confronts the whole world at this time, especially in regard to the effort that is being made by peoples all over the world to try to work out some plan whereby war may be made a thing of the past.

Mr. President, it is not as a former Secretary of State who has well and ably guided our Nation in its international relations, nor as a distinguished member of the Foreign Relations Committee who has displayed great learning and ability in shaping our foreign policies in the Senate, nor yet as a great orator of long service and recognized ability the world over in this body, that I would address you to-day, but merely as an ordinary man and as a humble Member of the United States Senate, unknown largely beyond the limits of my own State, fresh from contact with the plain people of America, that I would try to-day to voice the sentiments and express the hopes of the plain peoples of America and the world on the question of a permanent peace of the world, as near as that may be attained, and to submit my views on the effort that is being made to organize a league of nations to secure and maintain the peace of America and of the world.

I feel some delicacy, sir, in imposing upon the time of the Senate, but each of us in this body, composed of 96 out of a population of more than 100,000,000 of free American people, has the voice and the vote of more than 100,000,000 citizens of this great Republic, and I feel, sir, that when this most momentous question of all the ages is hanging in the balance that I should be recreant to my duty and shirking a responsibility did I not raise my voice in protest at much which has been said in this Chamber and elsewhere in regard to this supreme question, which is in the mind of thinking people everywhere.

I have listened with some impatience at the petty partisan criticisms of the President of the United States indulged in by some Senators on account of his visit abroad to confer with the leaders of the other great nations of the world, with whom we have been associated, in regard to the great settlements that must come as a result of the great world war just ended. I have noted with pity the action of certain Senators in having inserted in the *Record* newspaper clippings and other articles tending or attempting to bring the President of the United States into disfavor and contempt and ridicule of the world. I have pitied these men because they are injuring not the President in his great undertakings, but they are making themselves small indeed in the estimation of the American people.

The question of establishing a league of nations to maintain the peace of the world is not a political or partisan question; it is earnestly championed and advocated by the only two living Presidents of the United States—the one a Democrat, the other a Republican; but both, sir, of the very finest type of patriotic Americans—the one with power to act for America while he speaks, the other with power only to help create the proper sentiment in the country and to counsel and advise with those who have the power to act. All honor to William Howard Taft along with Woodrow Wilson. They are both playing their part in this great hour when the world needs men, high-minded men who would advance rather than retrograde, who would build up rather than tear down.

It is very easy to find fault, but it seems to be very hard for a partisan to be fair. It is very easy to tear down, but very hard to build up. It is easy to be destructive, but impossible for the narrow-minded bigot to be constructive. There has been enough of destruction and death in the world during the past four years to satisfy even the most savage. It is now

time for us to turn aside from war with all its ruin and misery and see to it, if possible, that nations are controlled as our Nation controls the several States and as our several States control the individuals in those States. There was a time when individuals settled their differences by might, regardless of right; likewise families and neighborhoods and clans settled their differences; but the human race has advanced, civilization has progressed, and law and order has evolved out of brute force. Men formerly fought duels, and thus settled their disputes. To-day he who kills his fellow man in a duel is an outlaw and a murderer, and the time will come—aye, it has already come—when a nation that makes war upon another except in self-defense or in the defense of civilization will be an outcast, and a murderer amongst the civilized nations of the world. The great anthem of the world to-day is peace—peace on earth, good will toward men. Every nation that has been at war has disclaimed responsibility for this war and declares that it only fought that fighting might be no more.

Every nation on earth yearns for perpetual peace, and I say that when the whole world wants the same thing at the same time for the whole world, then the world can and it will get that thing, and by the help of the great God of nations all the forces of hell can not prevail against it. This yearning for peace is in the hearts of the civil populations of the world, who have seen their loved ones wounded and bleeding and dying on the battle fields, who have seen their homes destroyed and their lands desolated, and who have seen their women violated and their innocent children tortured and crucified. This yearning for peace is in the hearts of the brave men who have gone forth to do and die for the cause of human liberty and freedom. They have seen the horrors of war; they have endured its agonies; they have witnessed its sufferings; they know the uselessness, the folly, the criminality of war except as it is fought in defense of home and country and civilization. They realize the crime of making unnecessary war, and he who to-day sneers at peace and every honest effort that can be made to effectuate the peace of the world as "a sort of international mutual admiration society, with the Sermon on the Mount for a constitution and the Apostolic Creed for a guide," will find that he is completely out of harmony with the spirit of the great American people, and especially that gallant army of 2,000,000 heroes who crossed the Atlantic Ocean to stop the mad dog of Europe in his wild orgy of destruction and murder. Let such a one read the letters from the men who have been over there, who have endured hardships beyond expression, who have laid out in mud-filled, water-soaked trenches for weeks at a time without changing clothes, who have gone out finally over No Man's Land and have witnessed the death of comrades all around them, who have finally fallen wounded on the field of honor with no one to render succor; fighting for you and fighting for me, fighting for loved ones, fighting for home, fighting for country, and fighting for humanity; read what these men say, learn what they have learned, see what they have seen, get their viewpoint, and you will no longer sneer at this great longing of the human race.

And he who sneers at peace is not much, if any, worse than that man who criticizes and finds fault with every effort, every suggestion for the accomplishment of peace. The conscience of the world is awake, the wisdom of the world is aroused, the mind of man has taken up the great problem, and it befits every man, and especially every one in high responsible position, to cease finding fault with others' ideas, except as he may point out other ideas that will better effectuate the purposes of the world, and the greatest purpose of the world to-day is the peace of the world.

The President of the United States has been harshly criticized for going abroad at this time and not remaining here to advise the Congress by those partisans who would not heed and follow his advice if he were here. He has been criticized for not disclosing to these enemies of the administration what terms of peace he may have in mind when they well know that neither Woodrow Wilson nor the combined peace delegates from this country can dictate the terms of peace. He has been attacked by Senators in a partisan spirit for not telling them what are the details of his scheme for a league of nations for the preservation of the peace of the world when they well know that such details must be the result of the combined wisdom and judgment of the representatives of all the allied nations, and possibly later of the representatives of the greater neutral countries of the world. They say that they want a lasting peace, but they are unwilling that the President shall go amongst the peoples whose support we must have to attain that result to get their opinions and to give them his judgment in order that an overwhelming sentiment may be created throughout the world for that peace which all true men must wish.



They demand that he shall give them advice which they will not take rather than confer with our partners in this great affair, to the end that out of the common councils of mankind some plan may be evolved that shall insure the world against a recurrence of the awful carnage that has desolated a continent and put the whole world in mourning.

Sir, those whose voices and whose words are potent to fix the opinions and direct the actions of a considerable part of our people, and who have some influence over the people of foreign lands by reason of holding for the time being high positions at the hands of the American people, have a great, an awful responsibility resting upon them. They can aid or they can retard the progress of civilization. If they would but forget self for a while, if they would rise to the true stature of full manhood, if they would but consider the men in the Army and the Navy, if they would look upon the sick, the wounded, and the dying who have sacrificed the comforts of life that this free Nation might still endure, that we might still have the opportunity to declare the policies and enact the laws by the suffrage of these people for the conduct of this great Republic, if they would but look upon the almost endless rows of new-made mounds mid the poppy fields of Flanders, if they would but look into the once happy homes of the world and see there the vacant chairs that stand "mute witnesses of the dissolution of the grave," it does seem to me that at this time, when the fate of the human race is in the balance, that Senators could forget that they are Democrats or Republicans; that they would remember that they are first of all Americans—Americans above State or section or party and as true Americans they are citizens of the world, with the interest of the whole human race at heart.

Our soldiers and sailors were neither Republicans nor Democrats. They came from no State nor section. They went into the Army and Navy as Americans, and when they had gone to the fields of battle they were brigaded with the men of our allies. They fought under the supreme command of that greatest of all modern commanders, Gen. Foch. They fought as soldiers of civilization side by side with the men of other countries, having the same end in mind, saving the world for liberty and freedom, and making the world a decent place for the habitation of man.

Did America lose her dignity or sacrifice any of her sovereignty when Gen. Pershing placed at the disposal of the allied high command the whole of the American forces? Did America in any degree lose any of her independence when by an almost unanimous vote of the American Senate and Congress, under the advice of the President, she cast her lot with the peace-loving, law-abiding nations of the world against the brutal, savage forces of the central powers that would have destroyed free governments from the world and set up military despotisms in their place?

If that be true, then the vast majority of this body, the vast majority of the other branch of the Congress, the vast majority of the American people who indorsed and applauded your action, must plead guilty to the charge of treason to our country, and the soldiers and sailors who have written a new chapter of glory into the pages of world history must admit that they fought as they had no right to fight. We went into this war not alone to avenge our own wrongs, not alone to defend our own rights, but, in addition to this, to protect and preserve the freedom and liberty of the world. To quote the words of Henry W. Grady:

We, sir, are Americans, and we fight for human liberty. The uplifting force of the American idea is under every throne on earth. France, Brazil; these are our victories. To redeem the earth from kinglycraft and oppression; this is our mission, and we shall not fail. God has sown in our soil the seed of His millennial harvest, and He will not lay the sickle to the ripening crop until His full and perfect day has come. Our history, sir, has been a constant and expanding miracle from Plymouth Rock and Jamestown all the way, ay, even from the hour, when from the voiceless and trackless ocean a new world rose to the sight of the inspired sailor. . . . Let us resolve to crown the miracles of our past with the spectacle of a Republic, compact, united, indissoluble in the bonds of love, loving from the Lakes to the Gulf, the wounds of war healed in every heart as on every hill, serene and resplendent at the summit of human achievement and earthly glory, blazing out the path and making clean the way up which all the nations of the earth must come in God's appointed time.

I sprang from the loins of Virginia, where my father entered the service of the Southern Confederacy. I was born of a South Carolina mother in that State, which was one of the original thirteen Colonies that formed this wonderful Union, that State that was first to secede from the Union. I am a product of the Civil War; had it not been for it my parents would probably have never met and I would never have been. I love the State of my father. I love the State of my mother. I love my own State, and I glory in its people and its history, but I love my country more than I love any State, and I thank God that it was not in the divine American plan that there should be two countries

where only one now exists. I find pride in Bunker Hill as I do in Kings Mountain. I find satisfaction in Appomattox, as I find joy in Yorktown. And when I say to you to-day that I am glad there is no Southern Confederacy, and I am overjoyed that the Union was preserved and has become forever indissoluble, I believe that I express the sentiments not only of the younger generation in the South but also the sentiments of the few remaining gallant men who wore the gray in the sixties and who after four years of brave fighting for what they conceived to be their rights returned to their desolated lands and ruined homes broken in fortune but undismayed in spirit, and beat their swords into plowshares and took up again with the same fortitude that had sustained them in war their peaceful pursuits as citizens of this great country to which they again had sworn their allegiance. And I call upon the whole world to witness that my people have been true to that allegiance; they have paid their share of the burdens of Government when they had but little from which to pay; they have poured their paltry earnings into the lap of industry; they have furnished all sections of this land with many of its brightest minds; they have furnished much of the very finest of American character uncontaminated by evil foreign influences; they have supplied their full quota of men for the Spanish War and for the great world war that is just happily coming to an end; those men joined with the men from all sections of America to make up the great American Army of freedom, liberty, and peace. They fought side by side with the men from every State in the American Union under the same flag that is loved in South Carolina as ardently as it is loved in New England. They mingled their life blood with the blood of all America on the battle fields of Europe, and the pages of American history are the richer for the sacrifice, and so to-day the American people are nearer one in purpose and in spirit than they have been for more than a half century.

The Army, with a northern man at its head, and the Navy, with a southern man at its head, know no North, no South, no East, no West—they know no section nor creed except America and what for America and the world is best. And, sir, in the Army and the Navy there are no Democrats nor Republicans—there are only American patriots, in civil life of all creeds and faiths and peoples banded together for a common purpose—the freedom and liberty and peace of the world, and I say to you to-day that the world can not be satisfied with anything less than the full fruits of all the sacrifices that the world has made—I say to you that we did not go into this war merely to humble the proud spirit of the central powers—we did not go into this war merely to tear down empires and thrones—we did not go into this war merely to banish kings and kaisers, but above all we went into this war to destroy militarism and destroy it for all time, and that can be done and it will be done by the creation and establishment of a league of nations to preserve and enforce the peace of the world. This is no new idea with me. As far back as the Fourth of July, 1912, speaking in South Carolina on the Nation's birthday I used this language, and these figures seem so small in the light of the present:

The total ordinary disbursements of the United States for last year amounted to more than \$630,000,000. Of this amount about 70 per cent was for the War and Navy Departments and for the payment of pensions growing out of former wars. In other words, my friends, the idea of war—wars of the past and preparation for wars of the future—is costing the American people \$438,000,000 annually, and this, my friends, is growing every year. This appalling statement of itself, it seems to me, is enough to make a practical, common-sense people stop and think.

Permit me to say right here that when we consider that this war has cost the American people more than \$30,000,000,000—more money than has been spent by this Government since its beginning up to the outbreak of this war—when we consider that England has spent more than \$40,000,000,000 and France a corresponding amount, if for no other reason the people of America and the people of the whole universe ought to stop and think of the burdens that are being placed upon the present generation, and upon generations yet unborn.

But when we consider that war never settles a controversy according to the justice of the cause—when equity and righteousness have no place in the final termination—when power and force are after all the determining factors in the question, and when the green valleys are painted a rich red with the lifeblood of thousands and tens of thousands of human beings who are called upon to sacrifice home and family and life on their country's altar, is it not time for us, a great Christian Nation, the hope of the world, in the great march of progressive thought and of civilization to seek about for a way to abolish war from the face of the world?

Just as 50 years ago, on the old muster field, the biggest man in the eye of young America was the one who could lick any other bully—just as a few years ago the biggest man was the one who, after a quarrel with his neighbor, could shoot the truest in the duel, just as the result of force settled differences between man and man, so still to-day the most powerful nation, with the greatest navy and the biggest army and the fullest treasury, lords it over the weaker nations of the earth, and every big nation feels called upon to be as fully



prepared for war that may never come as its strongest competitor for world power.

In the great Civil War the Federal Government put in the field 2,722,000 men—the Confederate Armies numbered about 750,000 men—the Federal Government lost about 350,000 men and the Confederate Army lost about 133,000 men. Think also, my friends, of the other wars of the United States and of the other nations of the world. Remember that it is to the advantage of every country on earth that the enormous expenses of war and fearful sacrifice of human life should cease, and I ask you is it hoping for too much when I suggest that this Government should take the initiative and try to get the other nations of the earth to join in a treaty whereby they would agree to submit all their differences to an international court of arbitration in which all nations have a representative except those who might be parties to the controversy—disband their armies except enough to insure domestic tranquillity—disarm their navies except to jointly maintain a navy sufficient to cope with the navy of any one country which refuses to enter into the compact, and then say to the world, "Thou shalt not commit murder."

South Carolina has always been progressive; she has always dared lead the way; she can on this anniversary of the Nation's birthday send out a message to the Nation and to the world of "Peace on earth, good will toward men," and I verily believe that that message taken up by the great Democratic Party and carried to the four corners of the earth by that greatest of American statesmen, William Jennings Bryan, who, like Clay and Webster and Calhoun, is too great to be president, commissioned by that other great man, Woodrow Wilson, the next President of the United States, will be received and acted upon by all the great Christian nations of the earth.

A part of my prophecies in that speech have come to pass. Woodrow Wilson has twice since that been elected President of the United States. Bryan was made Secretary of State and sought to draw the Christian nations of the world together in treaties that would have made war a remote possibility, if not an impossibility; but Germany, fully prepared for war, would not enter into such a treaty as was proposed. She had her great army and navy and her ambition for world domination staked upon her power, which was being increased daily; she had to justify her military preparations, with its enormous burden of taxes, before the German people, who were groaning under the burden, and so it was not given to the world to see that peace for which the plain people of the world prayed without another, and, we all hope, a final trial of armed force.

But to-day the only country, Germany, that stood in the way of the peace of the world lies prone and prostrate at our feet, stripped of all her power for evil and compelled to make any kind of peace that the conscience of the world may dictate, and I say, sir, that we, the American Senate, whether we be Republicans or whether we be Democrats, will be recreant to our duty and false to our people and traitors to the human race if we do not here and now highly resolve that we will lay aside all partisanship and all carping criticism, all faultfinding, unless we can suggest something better, and encourage, and advise with our representatives at the peace council at Versailles as to the best way to effectuate the hopes of mankind and the plans of God for the peace of the world for to-day, tomorrow, and forever. We have the great nations of the world banded together now in a way they have never been before—we see them linked together by a common purpose and a mutual interest that was never before conceived—we find them hating together the common foe of humanity and loving together the purest dream of the world, and while they are so banded and linked together there can be nothing of so great consequence as the perpetuation of the peace of the world. To-day is the time, tomorrow may be too late, and so I say that he who would postpone the consideration of the creation of a proper league of nations is hardly less an enemy to the human race than he who comes out boldly in full opposition and prates about the sovereignty of the United States and declares that he will not consent to arbitrate the Monroe doctrine and will not agree to send American boys to fight other peoples' battles thousands of miles away.

I shall not attempt to go into minute details as to the exact terms and provisions of a treaty or agreement for a league of nations. That must be worked out, if at all, by the peace delegates at the council, but, Mr. President, as I think of the world my mind turns back to nations; as I consider nations the United States of America rises before my vision, and I see here 48 sovereign States, originally 13 sovereign independent States or countries, bound together into the greatest Nation of the world. How came this about? When the Declaration of Independence was published to the world on the 4th day of July, 1776, 13 free and independent States were born, and until the adoption of the Articles of Confederation on the 15th day of November, 1777, there was nothing to bind these States together save the Declaration of Independence and the words therein contained. "We mutually pledge to each other our lives and fortunes and our sacred honor."

Then, Mr. President, on the 15th of November, 1777, was adopted the Articles of Confederation by the delegates of the United States of America, wherein it was provided "that each

State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence," and wherein it was provided that "the said States hereby severally enter into a firm league of friendship with each other for their common defense, the security of their liberties, and their mutual and general welfare, binding themselves to assist each other against all force offered to or attacks made upon them or any of them on account of religion, sovereignty, trade, or any other pretense whatever." It was also provided that "no State shall be represented in Congress by less than two, nor by more than seven Members." Again, it was provided that "no two or more States shall enter into any treaty, confederation, or alliance whatever between them without the consent of the United States in Congress assembled," and again it was provided that "no vessels of war shall be kept up in time of peace by any State, except such number only as shall be deemed necessary by the United States in Congress assembled, for the defense of such State or its trade; nor shall any body of forces be kept up by any State in time of peace, except such number only as in the judgment of the United States in Congress assembled shall be deemed requisite to garrison the forts necessary for the defense of such State."

Again, it was provided that "no State shall engage in any war without the consent of the United States in Congress assembled, unless such State be actually invaded by enemies \* \* \* and the danger is so imminent as not to admit of a delay till the United States in Congress assembled can be consulted." Further, it was provided that "all charges of war, and all other expenses that may be incurred for the common defense and general welfare, and allowed by the United States in Congress assembled, shall be defrayed out of a common treasury which shall be supplied by the several States" proportionately as the Congress of the United States shall from time to time direct and appoint, and finally it was provided in Article IX: "The United States in Congress assembled shall have the sole and exclusive right and power of determining on peace or war" except in cases of invasion or imminent danger of invasion, and of "entering into treaties and alliances, provided that no treaty of commerce shall be made whereby the legislative power of the respective States shall be restrained from imposing such imposts and duties on foreigners as their own people are subjected to, or from prohibiting the exportation or importation of any species of goods or commodities whatsoever." And, further, it is provided that "the United States in Congress assembled shall also be the last resort on appeal in all disputes and differences now subsisting or that may hereafter arise between two or more States concerning boundary, jurisdiction, or any other cause whatever," which authority, it was provided, was to be by arbitration fully set out in the Articles of Confederation, and was to be "final and conclusive."

The Congress was further given the power "to build and equip a Navy, to agree upon the number of land forces, and to make requisitions from each State for its quota."

Such were some of the provisions of the Articles of Confederation, adopted November 15, 1777, and ratified by all of the 13 States, save Georgia, by their respective delegates July 9, 1778, and ratified by Georgia about two weeks later. Such was the compact of peace and friendship among the States until the adoption of the Constitution of the United States in a convention held for the purpose on the 17th of September, 1787, and ratified by the requisite number of States in June, 1788.

And what changes in the scheme of the league of States for "to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity" were made in the Constitution from that provided in the Articles of Confederation? Turn to Article I, section 10, and you there find "No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation." "No State shall, without the consent of Congress, keep troops or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with another State or with a foreign power, or engage in war unless actually invaded or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay."

A Congress is provided, composed of two Houses, in which each State has equal representation in the one and proportionate representation in the other. The Congress is given power "to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water." "To raise and support armies." "To provide and maintain a Navy. To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions. To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States." "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the fore-



going powers and all powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof."

A Chief Executive is provided, elected by the States, not according to population alone, but by reason of the sovereignty of the State; each State has two electoral votes in addition to what it might have if the electoral vote were based on population alone. He is made Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States.

A Supreme Court is provided, with "such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish," and the judicial power extends "to controversies between two or more States; between a State and a citizen of another State; between citizens of different States; between citizens of the same State claiming lands under grants of different States; and between a State or the citizens thereof and foreign States, citizens, or subjects."

This, Mr. President, is the plan adopted by the fathers of our country to provide peace on the North American Continent. This plan, conceived in the minds of the pioneers of democracy, has kept the peace of America for nearly a century and a half, except for the unfortunate Civil War, and that war would probably never have occurred had the right or absence of the right to secede been made clear in the Constitution. The framers of the Constitution and the authors of the Articles of Confederation had nothing similar to guide them, they had no experience of a great Republic, such as ours, to point the way. They had but to trust in the God of Nations to guide their intellects, circumscribed as the human understanding must be. They went out into the trackless ocean and uncharted seas and made the greatest human experiment in political government that has ever blessed the world, and while they groped in the dark with a divine faith in the wisdom and integrity of their purpose, we of to-day have the benefit of more than a century of the light of experience to guide us and the whole human race in the greatest governmental venture of the ages.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the fathers of the Republic have written out the chart and have pointed us the way to the peace of the world to-day, to-morrow, and forever. When they thus provided for the American States we were far away from the balance of the world. We had no steamships, no telegraphs nor cables, no wireless that flashes the happenings of the whole world through distance, and it was because of these things that George Washington warned the American States "to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world," and it was because of this that he directed the attention of America to the fact that—

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none or a very remote relation.

Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

It was because of our "detached and distant situation," as it then existed, that he wisely asked:

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

To those who would to-day say that America should not form a league of nations to preserve, maintain, and enforce the peace of the world I would say that conditions have changed, our situation has been altered, distance has been destroyed, and time has been annihilated; we do not longer occupy a position of aloofness and isolation from the balance of the world; we to-day have reached that position in our upward march that we are not only a great country and a wonderful Nation, but we are to-day a very large and important part of the whole world and of the whole human race.

And this leads me, sir, to say that we have not followed this advice at all times, neither does that advice conjure us not to enter into temporary alliances nor to stay out of the extraordinary vicissitudes of the world. And surely no one will say that the present European conditions are "ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations of her friendships or enmities."

I would direct attention to the fact that we entered into a temporary alliance with France to obtain our freedom and independence—our country was born out of an alliance with France, whose aid in the American Revolution was so timely; we entered into an agreement with England to prevent the French settlement of the great country beyond the Mississippi, and thereby made possible the great Louisiana Purchase from France. We entered into an agreement or alliance with England whereby we were able to announce and maintain the Monroe doctrine—we, by that doctrine, practically set up a protectorate over the American hemisphere—we committed ourselves, for our

own protection, to the preservation of the sovereignty and integrity of the American countries in Central and South America—all foreign countries—and we have in this great world war formed an alliance with the great civilized nations of the earth against the central powers of Europe. So that to those who quote Washington's Farewell Address I reply, conditions have changed and our situation is altered; that this is no ordinary condition that might menace our peace by entrance into a league of nations, but it is an extraordinary condition out of which we seek to preserve and protect the peace, not only of America but of the children of men the world over.

It has been asked, "Would you be willing to arbitrate the Monroe doctrine?" Let me first ask, what is that doctrine and what stands behind it? The Monroe doctrine is merely the declaration of this Government that the American Continents are not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power, and that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their systems to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety, and that we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing any of the established, recognized governments of America, or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

This doctrine, enunciated by President Monroe December 2, 1823, could not have been maintained and enforced by the United States alone, and would never have been proclaimed even had it not been for the fact that the British Government, speaking through George Canning, its minister of foreign affairs, proposed to the United States that Great Britain and the United States should jointly announce that they could not see any South American territory transferred to any power "with indifference," and the British Government pledged itself to aid in the enforcement of this declaration. When President Monroe received this assurance he turned to Thomas Jefferson for advice, and Jefferson's reply to Monroe, upon which Monroe acted, shows that we have maintained the integrity of the Western Hemisphere and the peace and safety of the United States only by the acquiescence and assistance of Great Britain. Jefferson said:

One nation, most of all, could disturb us in this pursuit; she now offers to lead, aid, and accompany us. By acceding to her proposition we detach her from the bands, bring her mighty weight into the scale of free government, and emancipate a continent at one stroke which might otherwise linger long in doubt and difficulty. Great Britain is the one nation which can do us the most harm of any one, or all, on earth; and with her on our side we need not fear the whole world. With her, then, we should most sedulously cherish a cordial friendship, and nothing would tend more to unite our affections than to be fighting once more side by side in the same cause.

From that day to this the British Navy has been our first line of defense, alike in our youthful weakness and our matured strength, and we have at last fought "side by side in the same cause"—the cause of liberty and freedom and civilization—the bonds of friendship have been strengthened; they have been cemented by the mingled blood of Briton and American, shed on a soil foreign alike to both, made sacred alike to each.

You ask, "Would we be willing under a league of nations to arbitrate the Monroe doctrine or questions that might arise under it?" I reply, sir, that there can be no such thing as arbitration of the Monroe doctrine. It is merely America's statement of her will or pleasure, but the enforcement of it might raise questions that would have to be settled by force, by diplomacy, or by arbitration; and I take it that if a league of nations for peace shall be formed that the principles enunciated in President Monroe's message are so clearly a statement of justice to the United States and to the other American countries over whom we single-handed and alone, with the friendly assurances of Great Britain as our sole hope of assistance, have stood guard that this statement of principle would be incorporated into any compact that may be entered into not only for the countries of the Western Hemisphere but for all countries of the world. If a league of nations shall be formed, the combined nations of earth would enunciate and promulgate a new Monroe doctrine—a Wilson doctrine—that all the allied nations of the world "could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing any free nations or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any power on earth in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the people of the world," or, to paraphrase the statement of the Monroe doctrine by President Roosevelt: "The doctrine is simply a statement of our very firm belief that the nations now existing on earth must be left to work out their own destinies amongst themselves, and that free countries are no longer to be regarded as the colonizing ground of any foreign power." Thus, Mr. President, if a league of nations shall be formed, instead of a



doctrine for free peoples of the American Continent, upheld and maintained by the United States alone, we would substitute a broader doctrine for all the free peoples of the world, upheld and maintained by the combined civilized nations of the world who may enter into the league of nations; and the Monroe doctrine will be the safer, for that it would have more sponsors.

It is objected, Mr. President, that a league of nations to preserve and enforce peace must be backed by force, and that we would have to make war to restore peace. I agree that to have a league that will be effective there must be force to back up the decrees of civilization and justice. We have our police to put down crime and disorder in our cities, we have our sheriffs and constables to put down crime and disorder in our States, and they are armed, that the citizens generally may go unarmed and safe. We would need a limited national police force, and we would need an international police force to preserve the peace of the world and to enforce the decrees and judgments of the courts of the international league; but, sir, with armies reduced and navies dismantled, and an absolute prohibition to the countries of the world of the manufacture and having more than a supply of arms and munitions to meet the reasonable immediate needs of any country for its purely domestic peace and safety—that to be determined by the parliament of the world—a very small quota of men from each of the contracting nations would be able to bring law and order and obedience to the findings and decrees of the league of nations should any nation attempt to break the peace of the world.

It was objected by the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] that to raise this quota for service in international fields conscription would have to be resorted to. That, Mr. President, in my judgment, is not correct. There are enough of adventurous men—soldiers of fortune in every land on earth—to make up the quota that such country would be called upon to supply, and especially would this be true if the standing army was small and the pay increased to such an amount as would be attractive, and with greatly reduced military and naval forces every nation could pay its men liberally. But, sir, even if the draft should be resorted to, I say that it is far better to carefully select 50,000 men and compel them to serve for a few years to preserve the peace of the world than to be called upon to draft millions upon millions of men to restore peace after war with all its horrors and hardships has drenched the world in blood.

Mr. President, I have spoken too long, but I shall not be in this body much longer. I fear that the treaty of peace, embodying a reasonable and proper league of nations for the preservation of peace, will not be concluded and submitted to the Senate for ratification before my term of service shall have expired. I have spoken from the depths of my heart; I have tried to express the hope of the world; I have tried to utter the prayer of humanity; I have tried to aid, in my feeble way, in pointing out the path marked out by the teachings of Him who came to save and not destroy; I have tried to voice the sentiments of the plain people everywhere, who see in war, in most cases, a useless sacrifice of the children of God on earth.

I can not close my remarks without expressing my sorrow and disappointment at the utterances of some of the most distinguished Members of this body. As I have noted the great learning and scholarly attainments and giant intellects of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who has so long led the Republican Party, and at times the Nation in our foreign relations in the Senate, and of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], who has in days past so ably and creditably represented my country and his as Secretary of State; as I have sat in rapt admiration of the massive intellects and dynamic force of appealing oratory of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]; as I have noted these first two gentlemen advocating procrastination, and the other two not only advocating procrastination but declaring that a league of nations for the preservation of peace can not and should not be adopted, I wonder why, in this supreme hour of the world, the wonderful endowments of these gentlemen could not be used for construction rather than for destruction, why they do not use their great powers to build up rather than tear down, why they do not aid rather than criticize. They have an opportunity, this whole body has an opportunity, the Nation, the world, has an opportunity that was never afforded before to hasten the coming of the kingdom of God on earth.

There is a tide in the affairs of men, which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune; omitted, all the voyage of their life is bound in shallows and in miseries. On such a full sea are we now afloat, and we must take the current when it serves or lose our ventures.

I warn the gentlemen in this body that this is no ordinary political question. I warn the gentlemen that the American

people will not look with favor upon any man who would play politics in the people's blood. I do not question the motive that actuates those who oppose the advanced thought of the age—who assert opposition to the policies of Wilson and Lloyd George and Clemenceau, as expressed at the greatest feast since the Passover, but the American people, the people of the world, the God of the universe will hold them responsible if they place obstacles and obstructions in the way of saving the world from a repetition of its anguish of the past four years.

#### ADDRESS BY ASSOCIATE JUSTICE CLARKE.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, on Monday last there was ordered printed in the RECORD, on motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], an address by Hon. Albert J. Beveridge, at one time a member of this body, on the subject of a league of nations. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an address on the same subject by Hon. John H. Clarke, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, delivered before the American Bar Association in the month of August last. I submit this address at this time, Mr. President, because it seems to me exceedingly appropriate, in connection with the eloquent and inspiring address to which we have just listened from the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. POLLOCK].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### A CALL TO SERVICE.

THE DUTY OF THE BENCH AND BAR TO AID IN SECURING A LEAGUE OF NATIONS TO ENFORCE THE PEACE OF THE WORLD.

(By Hon. John H. Clarke, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.)

In January the last week of August seems so far away, and it is so difficult to deny Mr. Whitelock anything upon which he has really set his heart, that not long since I awoke to find myself face to face with an outstanding promise to address you here this evening, but without anything formulated or even formulating in my mind which seemed in the least likely to prove of interest to you.

As I sat in my study, confronted by this situation, my eye fell upon the forty-odd volumes of the reports of the American Bar Association, and as I reflected upon the hours and days of intense and intelligent labor which is there buried—I weigh my words—I forthwith determined not to discuss any of the recalcitrant problems of the law—any of those things which Stephen Leacock would say lie "behind the beyond"—but that I would speak to you of some phase of the subject which fills the minds and hearts and souls of us all.

And so my subject has become, the duty of the bench and bar of the country to awake, as it is not yet awake, I am sure, to the responsibility which the great war has cast upon us, as an influential and learned profession, of putting forth all of the power and influence which we possess for the purpose of securing, as the most important result of the war, the establishment of "a league of nations to enforce the peace of the world."

I am quite aware that there is nothing new that I can say upon this subject, which has been the dream of mankind for centuries and the theme of wide discussion for many recent years, but the selection is made because of the conviction on my part that new conditions have made the times ripe for such a league and because I believe that, next after the winning of the war, the matter of first importance to our country and to mankind is the securing of a peace so guarded by new sanctions that the immeasurable calamity of modern war, through which we are now passing, may not again return to desolate the world.

I shall not address myself, gentlemen of the bench and bar, to the expert international lawyers among you, but rather to those of the rank and file of the profession, upon whom will fall the duty of creating and giving leadership to that public opinion of our country, without which it will not be possible to take this fateful step forward in the organization of the international relations of the world. The detail of the constitution and organization of such a league will be for statesmen and international lawyers, but the securing of the acceptance of the principle involved and the answering of the objections to it will be for the general practitioners of the land, trusted counselors that they are of their neighbors in all matters of great public concern.

Fundamental to all that I shall say are these assumptions: That the German autocratic government shall be beaten to its knees and shall be definitely convinced that never again can a war of aggression be profitable in this modern world; that its military and naval establishments, as well as those of the other great nations, shall be greatly reduced and their arming for the future be greatly and strictly limited; and that after the war the German people, chastened as they will be in spirit and in purpose, shall be invited to share in a just, even in a generous, peace, without which the permanent peace of the world can never be secured.

Public international law, as we all know, first assumed definite form in the writings of the great philosophical jurists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It is made up of a blending of moral principles—of natural justice and reason—with the customs and practices of the more enlightened nations of the world in their dealings one with another.

With such an origin, naturally, some of the principles of this law had become more clearly defined than others prior to the outbreak of the present war, but none had been more generally accepted and observed than this: That the open seas are not the territory of any nation and are not subject to the jurisdiction of any power, but that they are the public highway of all nations, provided by God and nature for carrying on the business and intercourse of the world. It was determined with equal definiteness that the open or high seas comprise all that part of every ocean which lies without a line drawn parallel to the shore and distant 1 marine league from low-water mark. To that boundary the jurisdiction of the sovereign of the adjacent shore extends, but beyond it all waters are the common property of all nations. Long prior to this war it had also become the perfectly settled law of nations that private citizens of neutral States should be allowed to go to and fro on this ocean highway on peaceful errands in neutral ships or even in



belligerent ships, not men-of-war, as safely in time of war as in time of peace, subject only to visit and search and to the law of blockade.

The German Government had frequently and solemnly assented to all this as perfectly established international law, but nevertheless, in arrogant defiance, it proclaimed exclusive dominion over more than a hundred thousand square miles of the open ocean adjacent to the British Isles and, without notice or mercy, proceeded, to the limit of its power, to destroy every neutral ship, its passengers and cargo, which had the temerity to enter the area thus proscribed.

The right of every nation to remain neutral during the war and the duty of every belligerent to respect such neutrality has long been a rule of the customary or unwritten law of nations. When to this we add that in 1839 and again in 1870 the Kingdom of Prussia bound itself by solemn treaties to guarantee the neutrality of Belgium, and that in 1899 and again in 1907 the Imperial German Government, by Hague conventions, bound itself in equally solemn agreement with many nations to respect that neutrality, the utter lawlessness of the invasion of Belgium would stand confessed even if the chancellor of the German Empire had not publicly and scoffingly proclaimed it to be in open defiance of international law. "German faith," not "Punic faith," for all time to come will be the world symbol for international perfidy and dishonor.

In a Hague convention the German Government and its allies agreed with the other civilized nations that in case of war undefended towns or villages should not be bombarded in any manner whatever; that in sieges and bombardments measures should be taken to spare as far as possible buildings dedicated to religion, art, science, or charitable purposes, and hospitals in which the sick and wounded are collected for treatment; and the use of poison or poisoned weapons, projectiles, and materials calculated to cause unnecessary suffering were expressly prohibited.

And yet, further flouting this law which it had shared in making, the German Government has now for four years persistently bombarded undefended towns and villages, used poison gases, and selected libraries, churches, and hospitals as special targets for destruction.

These instances, a few from many, will suffice to recall to us all how completely international law has broken down under the stress of the great war. It has been trampled upon as ruthlessly by the central powers as it was by Napoleon a century ago; and in presence of the international anarchy which is the result men who prefer reality to self-delusion must be convinced, reluctantly but definitely convinced, that moral sanctions are not enough to restrain great nations engaged in war within the boundaries prescribed by civilization in time of peace, and that unless the coming settlement is to prove but an angry truce, a time of preparation for another war, the most pressing problem now before us is how we may furnish new and effective sanctions which will cause international law to be respected and obeyed as fully in time of war as it has been heretofore obeyed in time of peace.

But what is this next war to be? Military writers of Europe, obsessed with the belief that it is impossible for the future to improve upon the past and that another general European war is inevitable, are already busy discussing what its character shall be, and, in barest outline, this is the picture which they draw:

The Prussian military system, adopted by the other nations in this war, will be continued in preparation for the next and will result in creating armies of unprecedented size. So organized Russia should yield an army of 35,000,000 of fighting men. Germany and Austria 25,000,000, Great Britain, France, and Italy 25,000,000; and to go no further, our Army should exceed 20,000,000 of trained soldiers. To support such armies the industries of all of these countries must be organized primarily for purposes of war and the best energies of their peoples must be devoted to devising means for the destruction of human lives. Women must be conscripted for industry as men for fighting, and noncombatants will be destroyed as ruthlessly by other nations as they have been by Germany in the present war. Great guns now used by thousands will be numbered by tens of thousands, and machine guns by millions. Submarines will infest every sea and hundreds of thousands of airplanes and dirigible ships will fill the air. Chemists confidently declare that, released from the restraints of civilization, poisonous gases will be devised which, used by aerial flotillas and by guns of constantly increasing range, will destroy whole armies and cities in a single night. And, finally, revolting though the thought of it be, other nations, driven by desperation to the use of disease germs, now hinted at as the lowest depth to which Germany has sunk, will let loose a scourge upon the world, the ultimate effect of which upon the human race no man can measure.

The mind turns away in horror from this prospect of another war which would involve the destruction of modern civilization, if not of the human race. And yet in the presence of the experiences of the past four years, of the unprecedented extent and merciless ferocity of the present war, it would be rash to say that this picture has been overdrawn, that it is not a probable description of the abyss that lies before us if measures be not taken to prevent the coming of another war.

Three solutions have been proposed to avert this measureless calamity: The first, made in Germany, aims to establish a consolidated empire extending from the North Sea to the Persian Gulf, sufficient in extent to be self-sustaining in time of war and peace and with vassal populations great enough in numbers to support a German military establishment which it is believed could dominate the other nations, separated as they are, and thus be able to impose a permanent even though a sullen peace upon the world. To state this is to reject it.

The second, advocated sometimes by combinations of statesmen and men of business and sometimes by labor unions, proposes to strip the central powers of their military and naval strength and of their colonies, to impose upon them huge indemnities for the crimes against civilization of which they are so clearly guilty, and then by boycotts to continue against them a trade war after the present war, and thus to hold these powerful nations in permanent poverty and thereby in an unrighteous, which can not be an enduring, peace.

The third is a league of nations to enforce the peace of the world. The aim of such a league is to substitute conference for strife, justice and peace for cruelty and war, and in the happy phrase of President Eliot to bring "Peace on earth to men of good will."

This dream of mankind for centuries has been brought within the grasp of practical statesmanship by the declaration of President Wilson, assuredly voicing the desire and purpose of our whole great Nation, that the period of American isolation has passed, and that we are ready to unite with the other nations after the war in an international concert which shall hold the world at peace and render it impossible that such a catastrophe as is now upon us shall overwhelm us again.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have dwelt thus at length upon the necessity for a league of nations and upon the desperate alternatives of our fail-

ing to obtain it, not because I think that your choice, or that of the country, could be different from that which has been made for us by our President, but because when we shall come to the adoption of the league as a practical agency in international government such grave difficulties must be met that we shall be obliged to recur for encouragement and resolution, perhaps again and again, to what the result will be if we reject this which now seems the last, best hope of the world—and to that end we should keep it vividly in mind.

For us, as a Nation, there are grave constitutional questions involved, which it will be the duty of the bar to argue to a conclusion with the people and in the courts, but of which it would be obviously improper for me to speak beyond recalling that the Supreme Court has declared that the Constitution is not a strait-jacket by which the past is to be imposed upon the present, and that it is not a mathematical formula of undeviating application of public affairs. I may be permitted to add that it is the result of the decisions of that court that the Constitution is a working charter for a living Government, which has proved in experience perfectly adaptable to conditions of life and society of which its framers never dreamed.

For other governments there are questions of dependent nationalities; the extent to which existing alliances may be continued without being inconsistent with such a league; and what prospects of fair treatment the nations falling in the war would have in its councils for many years to come.

There are difficulties for all the nations in determining what the membership of the league shall be, and what the system of law which shall govern its deliberations. There must be delegation, if not surrender, of power, a difficult thing with men and nations, and a new restraint must be put upon national ambitions and pride. But above all there must be cultivated here and throughout the world a larger sympathy and vision—no less than an international mind. We must learn to look beyond frontiers and to find our national welfare in the general welfare of the world.

Yes; the difficulties in forming the league, in devising a constitution for it and in putting it into practical operation are many and grave, but they are not greater than were met and solved by our forefathers when they formed the league of the thirteen original States, framed and adopted our Constitution, and established this indissoluble Union of indestructible States. The problem before us now is more complex and, if possible, more fateful, but it is in character the same, and with this experience to guide us, ours is the Nation which least of all should be discouraged or dismayed. The crisis is unprecedented in the history of mankind and the difficulties in meeting it, here, as on the field of battle, constitute a challenge to all that is strongest and best in the free nations of the world.

But what is this league of nations to be?

The representative men of many nations are in singular accord in the conclusion that an international organization will not be accepted which goes further than to imperatively provide that war shall not be commenced until the subject in dispute shall have been submitted to an investigation by an impartial tribunal and its merits reported upon, with a further delay after such report, for new negotiations and for the public opinion of the nations involved to assert itself, informed as it would be by the disinterested investigation and opinion of the league.

It is widely believed that rarely would a nation assume the moral odium of going to war against the impartial conclusion of such a report, but it is also believed that in the present development of world opinion upon the subject the governments would not consent to unite in an agreement to enforce the acceptance of such a report upon an unwilling and dissatisfied nation.

In this belief a group of distinguished American statesmen, lawyers and publicists, with former President Taft as their leader, have rendered a great public service by formulating a constitution or convention for such a league, which may serve as a starting point for discussion now and when the time shall come for settling the terms of the treaty of peace.

The fundamental principles of this constitution are only two and they are very simple:

The first is that no nation which enters the league shall make war upon any other member until the question in dispute between them shall have been submitted to an international court, yet to be constituted, if the question in dispute is a justiciable one, or to a council of conciliation if the question involved is nonjusticiable in nature. The disputed question shall be investigated, with every assistance from the parties in the way of evidence and argument which the tribunal may desire, and a decision or report on the merits of the controversy shall be rendered in a written opinion, which shall be published. Such decision or report shall be published within a year after the case is submitted, and neither party shall commence war against the other within six months after it is rendered.

The acceptance of this principle should present little difficulty, for 30 nations have already accepted it in treaties with our Government which with great propriety have been officially termed "Treaties for the promotion of peace." These treaties have all been executed since August, 1913, and all of the important nations at war have joined in them excepting Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey—a significant circumstance in fixing the blame for precipitating upon the world the calamity of the present war.

The second principle of the proposed league is that if any member shall commence war upon another without submitting to the preliminary investigation and decision or report provided for, all of the others shall unite in the use of their economic resources and, if necessary, their military power to punish the recalcitrant member for violation of its pledged international faith.

Four years ago the first of these principles marked the extreme verge to which nations could be induced to go in the interest of peace, but the harsh teaching which they have received in the hard school of experience during the past four years has brought the responsible statesmen of the great nations to such a new sense of social duty and of international responsibility that the incomparable statement of President Wilson in favor of coercion to secure the peace of the world has called forth acceptances of it in principle from leading statesmen of Great Britain, France, Italy, Austria-Hungary, and for what it is worth from a chancellor of the German Empire, as well as from leaders of many of the lesser and neutral States.

The constitution proposed contains many administrative provisions, but these two are the fundamental principles on which it proceeds. It is to be observed that the agreement to resort to economic coercion and to war is only to compel delay until there shall be investigation and decision or report, and that it does not extend to enforcing such decision or report when either shall be rendered. After the requisite delay,



without incurring the odium of violating any covenant of the league, the savage tribunal of war would still remain open for any nation which should choose to resort to it.

While such a league would be a great advance toward permanent peace and should be accepted if a better can not be secured, yet personally I prefer the counsel of those who would strive to have the covenant of the league provide not only for delay until there shall be investigation and decision or report, but also that all of the resources, military and economic, of the members shall be used to compel its acceptance when made and obedience to all of its commands.

This, not only because I do not share the confidence which many have that a year's delay would suffice to prevent war by cooling fierce national hatreds, such, for instance, as exist among the Balkan States or within the Austro-Hungarian Empire, or by calming national ambition such as that of Germany, which has been half a century in cultivation and development, but also because I believe that the world is ready for this longer and final step forward toward permanent international peace.

Millions of men will return to their homes in every one of the important nations which should be members of the league, convinced by the lapse into savagery which they have seen with their own eyes, that trial by battle is as irrational a manner of settling a national as a private quarrel, and that the nearest approach to securing a just decision of a dispute by human agency is to be found in a council of conciliation or a court selected from the wisest and best of the citizenship of the advanced nations of the world. In the free nations these men will return to a deserved and dominating leadership as the saviors of free government, and in the enemy countries they will be all that will remain not discredited by defeat. Yes, I would confidently put my faith in the men who have seen the most of war, not at a distance, but in the trenches, "on the red edge of battle," as competent and willing to enforce a conclusion which makes for the enduring peace of the world.

Neither do I share the confidence which many persons have that our experience with our Supreme Court in settling disputes between States is conclusive evidence of what may fairly be expected of a similarly constituted international court dependent wholly on moral sanctions for the enforcing of its decrees. Not to dwell upon the futility of the Dred Scott decision, so hopefully relied upon to avert civil war, or the unfortunate party divisions of the judges of the Electoral Commission of 1877, it is sufficient to say that it may be convincingly advanced that the Supreme Court from very early times to decisions rendered in the current year has steadily declined to take jurisdiction over questions falling within the scope of the powers of the political—the executive and legislative—departments of our Government, and that it has been from political, not from justiciable, disputes that most of the past wars have sprung.

Here, if there were no other, is furnished to the bench and bar ample opportunity to serve our country in assisting our neighbors in determining whether this fateful league shall be one merely to enforce delay and investigation, or one the decisions of which shall have a sanction which will make them the accepted and obeyed international law of the world.

But whether this wider or the narrower scope shall be given to the league, the chief opportunity for service on the part of our profession will be in counsel with our fellow citizens as to its constitutionality and its membership, as to the wisdom of our country entering into any covenant—an entangling alliance it will be called—to engage in war it may be, to settle a quarrel which, it will be urged, may be no concern of ours, and as to the answers which should be given, to objections which will range from those of the hopeless and timid who think progress impossible and that future wars are inevitable, to the Chauvinists and selfish who declare that war is not an evil, but is a discipline necessary for the development of all that is best in the physical and spiritual qualities of mankind.

To the objection that we should not expose ourselves to the risk of becoming a party to the future wars of others, the sufficient answer is that it is no longer possible for us to avoid being a party to them. For three years our Government strove with indomitable resolution to avoid participation in the present war, protesting, reasoning, warning, that there was a limit to our endurance of injury and insult, but with the result at last that we were obliged to take up arms "to conquer or submit." These years of experience have demonstrated that the modern world is so knit together that our frontiers touch those of every other important nation; that the innocent must so suffer from future wars; that self-respecting neutrality has become impossible in any general war; and that all wars are likely to become general, and that therefore it has become the chief concern of all the peace-loving nations of the world that all war shall cease. Unless the league shall utterly fail of its purpose, membership in it will involve a covenant on our part to join the honorable nations of the world to protect ourselves and them from nations which are predatory and false, and waiving aside all higher motives, it is the part of prudence if we must make war to make it for a just cause and in the company of honest nations.

Shall Germany be an accepted member of this league of peace? Yes; by all means, yes! and Austria-Hungary also, and necessarily the six other great powers of the world—France, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Russia, and the United States—for without all of these the league would not be one to enforce the peace of the world at all, but an alliance offensive and defensive to prepare for the next war. Alliances and coalitions of nations rarely have long lives. Great Britain and Germany were allies in the Napoleonic wars and France was their enemy; Great Britain, France, and Turkey were allies in the Crimean war and Russia was their enemy; Germany and Austria were enemies at war in 1866; Russia and Japan, allies in this war, were enemies in 1905; the friendship of Great Britain for France and Russia is of recent origin, and Italy was in terms an ally of Germany and Austria when the present war began. The teaching of this reference to the experience of a hundred years is plain. If Germany and Austria shall be excluded from the league, all of the ingenuity and resource and power which they possess will forthwith be used to strengthen their alliance and to sow discord in and weaken that of their adversaries, and all Europe, divided again into hostile groups, will inevitably return to the old suspicions and to rivalry in arms and armaments in preparation for another war.

This also must be accepted as fundamental, that no peace can be enduring which is not a just peace and that no league can be permanent which does not afford a reasonable prospect of just treatment to every member of it.

To exclude the German and Austrian people from the league, to attempt to impoverish two such great nations and to hold them permanently poor, possessed as they have proved themselves to be of approximately one-half of the military power of the world, would be

to invite new coalitions and alliances and would render inevitable that next war which the prophets of evil so confidently predict.

Equally unfortunate would it be to confine the membership of the league to the great powers. The presence in the league of the secondary and now largely neutral powers, including from America at least Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, will be clearly necessary to persuade Germany and Austria to enter it, for otherwise they would see themselves opposed in the league, as they are now on the field of battle, by the six other great powers, and it would be futile to try to persuade them that for many years to come they could expect from such a court that impartiality and freedom from prejudice so necessary to securing a just settlement of any disputed questions by conference and argument. But in such larger group suggestions of disinterested fairness and sympathy would be possible on which all of the present combatants might confidently rely for an impartial hearing and a just decision.

It is just as necessary to the success of the league that every member nation shall believe that it will receive just treatment as that it actually shall receive it when the time of test shall come. We must aim at a constructive and healing peace—not at an angry, sullen truce which will lead to further war.

There is evidence enough of opposition in this view abroad in the world to make the cultivation of it an opportunity for fruitful service by the members of our profession, natural leaders that they are of that public opinion of our country, to which the responsible statesmen of the allied powers have already shown the greatest deference, as it has been formulated on this subject by President Wilson, in statements which it is not exaggeration to say have been "heard 'round the world."

Shall all questions in dispute between nations be submitted to the league, or shall those relating to vital interests, to independence, or to national honor be excepted, as they have been in arbitration treaties of the past? Or, differently and specifically, are we ready to submit the validity of the Monroe doctrine or the necessity for our going to war with France or Great Britain, with Argentina or Brazil, to the decision of a body in which we should have no greater vote than each of the seven other great powers would have?

Here is the test of our faith—the measure of our confidence in that international tribunal of peace and justice which we are recommending to the other nations of the world.

Not until our allies and friends shall become as internationally faithless as the Germans are can we be called upon by the league to make war upon them, and that is a contingency which we refuse to consider.

Do we lack confidence in the moral basis of the Monroe doctrine? There is one of us who does not. Whatever infirmity may have been thought to be in a doctrine of such comprehensive scope when it was announced has disappeared in the experience of almost a century in which it has preserved all America from sharing in the conditions which precipitated the conflagration in Europe and South America from the untoward fate which the partition of Africa has brought upon that unhappy continent. The noble conception which set apart this hemisphere to development under institutions of its own creating, which cut it off from the intrigues and jealousies of Europe, and which, insuring it from alien influences, has made possible the development of the strong and free States which have emerged one after the other to the south of us has so justified itself that the doctrine could confidently be submitted for approval to any tribunal which such a league would constitute. We all submit our private differences, involving our lives, our fortunes, and our honor, to domestic tribunals, and many of us with equal confidence often submit our rights to the determination of the tribunals of foreign States. Why should we prefer the gun and the torch for the settlement of public controversies? Does the cynical definition of a question of honor still hold true, as one which men refuse to solve by reason?

But I can not pursue objections further in an address which I am admonished must be short. Their name is legion; they will come from the genuine and from the false in every part of our land, and I am pleading with my professional associates that we accept it as our patriotic duty to be ready in every town and hamlet to answer them and to advocate the taking of this step forward toward the realization of the reign of law, without which the allied nations will have fought this desperate war in vain.

The President calls us to this service in his declaration that "mere agreements may not make peace secure. It will be absolutely necessary that a force be created as a guarantor of the permanency of the settlement so much greater than the force of any nation now engaged or any alliance hitherto formed or projected that no nation, no probable combination of nations, could face or withstand it. If the peace presently to be made is to endure, it must be a peace made secure by the organized major force of mankind."

The young men going forward to take their places in the line of battle call us to this service. In every land, with a unanimity which makes it all but a battle cry, they declare that for them this is a war to end all wars; that it shall not cease until the authors of it are punished and freedom and justice and peace are made secure in the world; and that never again shall such a calamity return to desolate the earth. These men will return to dominate, I repeat, to deservedly dominate, the governments which they have saved, and they will not be balked in the accomplishment of their purpose.

But, nevertheless, it is believed that there is as yet no such general thinking or discussion of this vital subject throughout our land as is necessary to the creating of a public opinion sufficient to sustain the President when he shall press it upon the attention of the nations as the most important provision of the treaty of peace—and assuredly there is no agency for the creating of such public opinion comparable to the bar of the United States.

Ladies and gentlemen, the achievement of our country since we entered the war has been very great. Overwhelmed by the magnitude and horror of the struggle, the European nations did not realize the ultimate purpose of the evil genius of the German Government until, in accepting the challenge of the central powers, President Wilson put a new face upon the war and raised it to a new level by declaring, what all the world instantly recognized as true, that this is the fateful, final contest between autocracy and freedom; that it is a war on Germany's part to restore the dominion of kingly government throughout the earth, and on our part and that of our allies to make the world "safe for democracy." This definition alone, watchword and ideal of the free nations that it has become, has proved a moral inspiration to them all equal to the winning of many battles.

When the failure of Russia released great armies for use upon the western front, how splendidly did our country respond to meet the crisis thus precipitated in the fate of freedom and of mankind! By



a marvel of energy and organization, a million of men, since proved to be as good soldiers as any in the world, were safely and swiftly transported over 3,000 miles of stormy and pirate-infested seas to meet the savage onslaught upon heroic France. They met and turned back the tide of invasion, and with our brave allies made the Marne "a river more fateful than the Rubicon," and gave us sure promise of abundant military glory yet to come.

But a greater honor lies beyond. When the war shall end and the roar of the great guns shall cease there is reserved the supreme distinction of all history for the nation which shall have the inspiration of vision and the greatness of soul to lead the other nations of the world out of the valley of the shadow of death of recurring wars into the haven of enduring peace. Pray God that nation may be ours!

#### CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GAY in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Hitchcock	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Jones, Wash.	New	Smoot
Borah	Kellogg	Nugent	Spencer
Chamberlain	King	Overman	Sterling
Fletcher	Kirby	Page	Sutherland
France	Knox	Penrose	Thomas
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Pittman	Trammell
Gay	Lenroot	Poinexter	Underwood
Gerry	Lewis	Pomerene	Walsh
Gronna	McKellar	Shafer	Warren
Hale	McNary	Sheppard	Wolcott
Henderson	Martin, Ky.	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to announce the absence of my colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] on account of illness.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GORF] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-seven Senators have answered to their names; there is not a quorum present.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I suggest that the names of the absentees be called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the names of absent Senators.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. SAULSBURY, and Mr. SWANSON answered to their names when called.

Mr. CUMMINS, Mr. RANDELL, Mr. FERNALD, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. KENYON entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. KENYON. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

#### VALIDATION OF WAR CONTRACTS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13274) to provide relief where formal contracts have not been made in the manner required by law.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Hitchcock bill was considered by the Committee on Military Affairs, as has been stated, and reported by a majority of the committee and the unanimous vote of those present, and therefore took its place upon the calendar. The fact that the committee took such action, and afterwards the inconsistent one of favorably considering a bill largely different in its character and scope needs a word of passing explanation.

The Hitchcock bill was very carefully considered by the subcommittee; indeed, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] does his full duty upon every committee of which he is a member. The Senator gives his best thought and his best work to every task that is imposed upon him by his senatorial duties; and it is no reflection upon him that the bill now before the Senate was recommended in its place, but the attention of the committee was called to some of the operating features of the proposed measure, which convinced me that the bill which was offered as a substitute for the measure advocated by the Senator from Nebraska, and which the committee subsequently reported as a substitute for the House bill was, as an operating measure, not only a more effective but perhaps the only effective one of the two.

Mr. President, the subject matter of this bill is composed of a large number of items; that is to say, of different contracts—contracts executed improperly, contracts written but not executed, and oral contracts. It also embodies a geographical condition, these contracts being spread over a large portion of the United States, and involving a detail of production comprehending practically every element essential to the necessary prosecution of the war.

There is no question that these contracts should ordinarily have been signed, and signed in the manner required by the statutes. As an abstract proposition, no one can gainsay this. The statutes of the United States necessarily require care in the execution of contracts calling for an expenditure of public money and in accordance with formulas deemed by Congress to be essential to the public welfare and protection. These were not so executed, and I think for the best of reasons. When engaged in a great war, when in the midst of a great offensive, when conditions crowd upon each other with tremendous rapidity, and when emergencies arise requiring the utmost expedition to meet them, the department would have been false to the country and to itself if it had done otherwise than to act as the emergency required, notwithstanding the necessary disregard of statutory requirements. To have done otherwise might have involved the country in disaster; and I do not think it is fair to reflect upon the action of the department in the making of these contracts in view of these conditions.

There are times, Mr. President, when to follow the law may mean disaster; there are times when to disregard it and take the chances is the highest form of patriotism; and I am satisfied that the course pursued by the War Department with regard to the great, the overwhelming majority of these contracts was the only one to take, and without which the country, indeed, the allies, might have suffered very seriously. And because, Mr. President, they shouldered this responsibility, we should applaud them.

On the other hand, the contractees, men and corporations, who took the chances and came to the help of the Government under these circumstances are entitled to our gratitude and to our thanks; and the least we can do is to save them from the loss with which they are now confronted, and to do it as expeditiously as possible. So that the situation is an unavoidable one. If anybody is to blame for it, it is the nation or the nations responsible for the war. It is not to be attributed to any lack of conscientiousness upon the part of public officials or to any disregard of the law, but to the necessity of the situation, which is said to know no law.

Nor, Mr. President, am I impressed with the idea that the War Department, in its transaction of the public business during the last two eventful years, should be subject to no general criticism of dishonesty or laxity in the performance of its public duties. This department has been intrusted with the expenditure of somewhere in the neighborhood of twenty or twenty-five billions of dollars, the largest sum of money ever intrusted to any department in this country or any other.

There may have been, and probably are, instances—it would be remarkable if it were not so—where men engaged in the public service have, directly or indirectly, profited by their positions. It may be—it would be singular indeed if, under the temptations everywhere surrounding them, in view of the enormous amounts of money at their disposal and the opportunities coming their way—some official here and there did not yield to the surrounding temptations and fall by the wayside. I do not know of any individual instance myself; but, as I say, I shall be immensely surprised if numbers of them are not developed as these contracts are considered and allowed or rejected.

Mr. President, I want to say as a general fact that in the management of this great enterprise, from its commencement to its successful termination, speaking broadly and generally, the War Department has administered the affairs of the Government with honesty, with efficiency, and with success. It is entitled to, and should receive, the warm thanks and gratitude of the people of the United States; and, because here and there a man is under suspicion, I do not think that the Secretary and his able assistants should be subject to a reflection resulting from these individual instances, however well founded they may be. In other words, I am willing to trust the War Department, which made these contracts, with the duty of adjusting them and making appropriate settlements. Indeed, I do not think any other department is so competent to do it, or any other commission which we may provide for or which the President may appoint.

The purpose of this bill is to provide for the settlement of contracts, not their adjudication. It is to provide for the setting aside of those statutory requirements, the nonobservance of which invalidates the contract. It is very much as though you and I were face to face with a contract which we had made and which for some reason was invalid, but which nevertheless we entered into in good faith in an emergency and which, therefore, should be recognized. Now, who are the best people to consider that situation if our minds run in the same direction? Who besides us, who are parties to the contract, should interfere, or can interfere, in the absence of controversy? I do not think, Mr. President, that there will be much controversy with



regard to the bona fides of these transactions. I do not see how there can be. If a man has a contract irregularly executed, or not executed at all, but upon which nevertheless he has acted, there is no ground for adjudication but for recognition and for action upon such recognition; and this brings me, Mr. President, to that feature of the Hitchcock bill which my better-informed judgment has forced me to reject. I refer to that provision of the bill which creates a commission and refers all these contracts to it for adjustment.

The idea is an excellent one, and if but half a dozen, or even a hundred or a thousand contracts were involved it might be the better one; but I am afraid, Mr. President, that in practical operation it will prove to be not only unsatisfactory but delusive, and that instead of granting a remedy it will virtually interpose an obstacle to the ultimate determination of these very insistent matters.

Now, let us see.

It was stated here yesterday afternoon by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] that the Assistant Secretary of War had informed him yesterday morning that there were 6,000 of these contracts, involving \$1,766,000,000. The State of Colorado was admitted into the Union on the 1st of August, 1876, or 43 years ago. Its Federal district court has been one of the busiest in the land, and the amount of business it has transacted is enormous; yet I think its general docket numbers scarcely exceed 6,000 up to this time. The Supreme Court of the United States has been in existence since the Constitution was adopted. I think its general docket number is under 20,000, although it has been doing business for a century and a quarter. Six thousand contract cases, Mr. President, present to the mind a number the magnitude of which it does not fully comprehend, except upon reflection; and when these 6,000 contracts represent an average of \$294,333 apiece in amount, then the number of the contracts assumes additional dignity and importance because of the average amounts they involve. Of course, many of them involve far more and many far less than this average; but I undertake to say that it would be difficult to conceive of an aggregation of 6,000 controverted cases, the average of which are nearly \$300,000 apiece, except the one which we here are considering.

Mr. President, how long would it take a commission doing its duty between the Government on the one side and the contractors on the other to dispose of these 6,000 cases? First, they must investigate the facts concerning the execution of the agreement—the manner, in other words, in which the contract was evolved—and the circumstances surrounding it; second, the amount of money to be allowed as a fair adjustment upon its recognition. How long will each case take? The average case of importance tried in the courts requires more than one day. There are 300 working days in a year; and if this commission were able to dispose of one case per day, or 300 cases per year, it would have to be in session for 20 years before the 6,000 contracts would be disposed of.

It is true that the Hitchcock bill provides for the appointment of regional boards of examiners; but these regional boards have not the power of determining upon the facts. They take testimony, and the board or the commission, in order to acquaint itself of the facts, must read that testimony, must digest it, and then pass upon it.

Suppose that the commission tried two cases a day; there is 10 years. Ten cases a day would take 2 years; 20 cases a day would require 12 months after the commission is appointed to dispose of these 6,000 cases, and of course that is an absolute impossibility.

To my mind, therefore, the creation of a tribunal of any sort to handle exigent matters of such tremendous scope, comprehending so many items and so much money, would be a practical denial of justice to the holders of these claims against the Government.

On the other hand, the War Department has its machinery already in operation, and only awaiting congressional action to go ahead with this important business and transact it as expeditiously as possible. Up to the time that the question of the validity of these contracts was raised and determined adversely, they were proceeding, and proceeding very expeditiously, to dispose of the matters. The Senator having charge of the bill yesterday inserted, at page 2289 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and following, an outline of the staff of the commissions or boards, or whatever they may be called, which have already been provided for, and which, upon the enactment of this measure, can in their respective jurisdictions take hold and dispose of these claims.

I am willing to trust the Secretary of War, I am willing to trust the boards, the commissions, and the individuals that have been selected for the purpose of transacting this very impor-

tant business. I know that with the possible exceptions that may occur, the great body of these men are just as anxious to serve the Government and just as honest as you or I.

Mr. President, in a matter of this sort, time is of the utmost importance. As lawyers say, it is of the essence of the situation. Delays are expensive, not only to those having claims against the Government but to the Government itself. Every day that these claims remain undisposed of is an added expense of millions of dollars to the Government of the United States. In France alone there are claims involving over three-quarters of a billion of dollars—claims which, in my judgment, are not affected by the statutory requirements relating to the execution of contracts in the United States; claims needing adjustment there and here to save from bankruptcy men and corporations who have tried to help the Government, and have taken these chances; claims the settlement of which is necessary to the continued employment of labor in this country; claims the justice of which is beyond doubt in most cases; claims the settlement of which is essential to the welfare of the Government and to those who hold them.

That being so, let us give jurisdiction to that tribunal whose machinery will enable it to act upon these things at once, and have them all practically determined and disposed of within the next four or five months. That is beneficial to the Government. That, and that alone, Mr. President, is the extension of true and adequate justice to the men and the corporations who need this legislation so badly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I shall ask for a roll call on the vote between the committee bill and that which bears my name. I should like to ask the chairman whether he has any objection to substituting my bill for the House bill without a record vote. If by consent it can be substituted for the House bill, then we will have only one record vote.

Mr. KIRBY. I should object to that. It would be adopting the Hitchcock substitute.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the question first comes on substituting the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; my amendment is an amendment to the House bill; that is, it is perfecting the House bill; and after it is perfected the Senator from Oregon will move to substitute his bill for the House bill as perfected.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think probably the record vote had better come on the pending question.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; but I was just suggesting that we will avoid that by adopting my amendment as a substitute for the House bill at this time.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator that I think the record vote had probably better come on substituting his measure for the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. As a preliminary, then, to a vote, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Johnson, Cal.	Nelson	Smoot
Beckham	Johnson, S. Dak.	Now	Spencer
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Sterling
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Page	Sutherland
Cummins	King	Penrose	Swanson
Fletcher	Kirby	Poindexter	Thomas
France	Knox	Pollock	Townsend
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Reed	Trammell
Gay	Lenroot	Shafroth	Underwood
Hale	McKellar	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Hardwick	McNary	Simmons	Walsh
Henderson	Martin, Ky.	Smith, Ariz.	Weeks
Hitchcock	Moses	Smith, Ga.	Wolcott

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] are detained on official business.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. OVERMAN] on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of New Mexico in the chair). Fifty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, the principal difference now between the substitute amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and the committee bill is the original jurisdiction of the commission which is provided for in both bills to determine these claims, the Hitchcock amendment giving full and complete jurisdiction to the commission, with certain limi-



tations, which I shall refer to in a moment. The committee bill provides that the Secretary of War shall in the first instance adjust these claims and with the approval of a representative of the Department of Justice may pay them to the contractor, but the contractor, and in certain cases the Department of Justice, may appeal to the commission.

I think we are all in sympathy with the purpose the Senator from Nebraska desires to accomplish if it were practical, but even the Senator who proposes this amendment recognizes the fact that it is not practical to give original jurisdiction to this commission to investigate fully and determine all these claims, because to do so would involve months and months of delay and disaster to many, many industries in the country.

The Senator from Nebraska has sought to avoid that very serious difficulty by the provision in his amendment which provides that the Secretary of War shall file with the commission a statement of the award that he believes to be just and the amount which the claimant is entitled to. Then he provides that if the claimant shall file a statement with the commission "offering to accept the amount awarded by the War Department in full for said claim the commission shall, within 10 days, order the same paid in the absence of evidence that it is excessive."

Mr. President, to my mind this language, if it shall be adopted, will prevent the commission from examining the very cases that it ought to examine and investigate. It will deprive the commission of the jurisdiction where it will be beneficial to the Government and give it to the commission only where it is in the interest of the contractor. Why do I say that? Because with the very minimum number that has been suggested of 6,000 claims, and the Senator from Tennessee suggested it might run from 10,000 to 60,000 claims, with the War Department now prepared with a very large percentage of them to immediately make adjustments, what would happen if the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska is adopted? We would have immediately filed with this commission some thousands of claims. Supposing there were only 100 claims a day, every one of those claims under the Senator's amendment must be paid at the end of 10 days, unless there is evidence produced before the commission that the claim is excessive.

Mr. President, it would be a physical impossibility for this commission to get before it evidence that these claims were excessive within the period of 10 days. The commission would have no authority to retain jurisdiction of these claims longer than 10 days, unless after the filing of the claim it had proceeded upon investigation of that claim and had before it some evidence that the claim was excessive.

It may be said that it might call upon the War Department for all the files and testimony and records. I call attention to the fact that under the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska the War Department is not required to file any papers other than a statement of the amount awarded and the name of the contractor. But suppose the commission pursued that plan and asked the department for all the files and all the claims and all the testimony it had upon file before it, the commission certainly would not go upon the theory that some of the claims were excessive and permit payment of same, and take jurisdiction of others, because if it had only 100 claims a day for 10 days what would it mean? It would give the commission about six minutes for the investigation of a claim to find out whether, in its judgment, there was some evidence that the award was excessive—an absolute impossibility.

So the result would be, in my judgment, under the Senator's amendment, that, if there are awards that are excessive by the War Department, the contractor, of course, would immediately file his acceptance of that award, and the commission would have no opportunity within the 10 days to secure or produce evidence that it was excessive, and it would then become mandatory upon the commission to pay that excessive claim.

Now, contrast that with the provision in the committee bill. In my judgment, the phraseology is not happily worded, but I do not think there can be any question as to the construction. Under the committee bill the provision is as follows:

That within 30 days of the date when the Secretary of War tenders any contract or compensation as provided in this act, or refuses to tender such contract or compensation, the party to whom said contract or compensation is tendered or refused or the Government, by a duly authorized officer from the Department of Justice, may file with the chairman of the commission a notice of appeal: *Provided, however*, That if the representative of the Department of Justice agrees with the action of the War Department there shall be no appeal by the Government, but settlement can be made at once.

As I construe the committee bill, it is contemplated that representatives of the Department of Justice shall work with the War Department at all times, acting as counsel for the Government in the investigation of these claims; that when the Secretary of War shall make an award if counsel for the Government shall

be of the opinion that that award is or may be excessive he then has 30 days in which to further investigate that question and make an appeal. Then if he believes that it should be investigated by the commission he files his appeal.

In other words, under the committee proposition counsel for the Government sits in and is familiar, as counsel for a private party would be, with all the proceedings, and then when the award is made he still has 30 days within which to file his appeal, unless he is satisfied that justice is done to the Government and that the interests of the Government are protected.

As I said, I do not think that this provision is happily phrased. I do not think that the word "tenders" is a proper word to use in this connection. Certainly, it is not used here, I think, in the ordinary sense of a legal tender. The phraseology later on is absolutely contrary to any such idea, because to tender compensation ordinarily would mean that the party to whom compensation is tendered could immediately accept it. When it is said in the same paragraph that if the representatives of the Department of Justice agree with the War Department a settlement may be made at once, it seems to me that that negatives the idea that the word "tenders" is not used in its ordinary meaning. It does seem to me that that should be cleared up, and I think the word "offers" or "proposes" should be used.

Mr. KNOX. Where is that to be found?

Mr. LENROOT. On page 7.

Mr. McKELLAR. In what line?

Mr. LENROOT. In line 20 of the reprint.

I wish to ask the chairman of the committee whether in his opinion I have given the interpretation to this language he thinks the committee intended to give to it?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That was the intention of the committee.

Mr. LENROOT. Does not the chairman think that there should be some other word than the word "tenders" to express the purpose?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the Senator can suggest a word, I will be glad to accept such an amendment, because that was the purpose of the committee.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator then agree to strike out the word "tenders" and insert the word "offers"?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no objection.

Mr. LENROOT. I think that that would clear it up. I will then offer an amendment on page 7, line 20, to strike out the word "tenders" and insert the word "offers."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In the original print, page 7, line 12, after the word "War," strike out the word "tenders" and insert the word "offers."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. My next amendment is to strike out the word "tender" and insert the word "offer" after the word "to" in the next line.

The SECRETARY. On page 7, line 13, before the word "to," strike out the word "tender" and insert the word "offer."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. I think it must be very clear that before payments can be made under the committee bill the counsel for the Government must agree that the payment is proper and the interest of the Government is protected. If he is not so satisfied, under the committee bill he has 30 days in which to further investigate, and either agree or appeal, while under the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska these things must be determined within 10 days, and in cases where an award is excessive the interests of the Government are not protected under his proposition.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I feel very clear that for the protection of the Government the bill as reported by the committee is preferable to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK].

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Before the question is put, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Gay	Jones, N. Mex.	Lenroot
Beckham	Gore	Jones, Wash.	McKellar
Borah	Hale	Kenyon	Martin, Ky.
Chamberlain	Henderson	King	Moses
Culberson	Hitchcock	Kirby	Nelson
Cummins	Johnson, Cal.	Knox	Nugent
Frelinghuysen	Johnson, S. Dak.	La Follette	Page



Poindexter  
Pomerene  
Reed  
Saulsbury  
Shafroth

Sheppard  
Smith, Ariz.  
Smoot  
Spencer  
Sterling

Sutherland  
Thomas  
Townsend  
Trammell  
Underwood

Vardaman  
Walsh  
Warren  
Weeks  
Wolcott

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. LEWIS and Mr. SWANSON answered to their names when called.

Mr. FERNALD entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK].

Mr. HITCHCOCK. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. In his absence, I refrain from voting.

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] and vote "nay."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when Mr. WILLIAMS's name was called). The senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is on his way here, but he has been unavoidably detained. He stated to me that he would vote "nay" on this question.

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded,

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING], but I am authorized to vote on this question. I vote "nay."

Mr. PENROSE (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I know that that Senator has not voted, but in view of the statement of his attitude made by the chairman of the committee, I will permit my vote to stand.

Mr. MYERS. Has the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], which I transfer to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] and vote "nay."

Mr. LODGE. I desire to announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] is detained on official business.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] is necessarily absent on official business. If present, he would vote "nay" on the passage of the bill.

Mr. POLLOCK. I desire to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], is detained on account of illness.

Mr. LODGE. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY];

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK]; and

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

The result was announced—yeas 8, nays 55, as follows:

## YEAS—8.

Borah	Hitchcock	La Follette	Nugent
Gore	Jones, Wash.	McKellar	Reed

## NAYS—55.

Bankhead	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Smoot
Beckham	Jones, N. Mex.	Page	Spencer
Chamberlain	Kirby	Penrose	Sutherland
Culberson	Knox	Pittman	Swanson
Cummins	Lenroot	Poindexter	Thomas
Fernald	Lewis	Pollock	Townsend
Fletcher	Lodge	Pomerene	Trammell
France	McNary	Ransdell	Underwood
Frelinghuysen	Martin, Ky.	Shafroth	Wadsworth
Gay	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Walsh
Hale	Moses	Sherman	Warren
Hardwick	Myers	Simmons	Weeks
Henderson	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Johnson, Cal.	New	Smith, Ga.	

## NOT VOTING—33.

Ashurst	Goff	McLean	Smith, S. C.
Baird	Gronna	Norris	Sterling
Brandeggee	Harding	Owen	Thompson
Calder	Hollis	Phelan	Vardaman
Colt	Kellogg	Robinson	Watson
Curtis	Kendrick	Saulsbury	Williams
Dillingham	Kenyon	Shields	
Fall	King	Smith, Md.	
Gerry	McCumber	Smith, Mich.	

So Mr. HITCHCOCK's amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I believe the vote now is on the committee amendment as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The vote is on the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide relief in cases of contracts connected with the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes."

## POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 13308, known as the Post Office appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads with amendments.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be first acted on.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask the Senator from Alabama to consent to have his bill laid aside temporarily in order that I may secure the disposition of a conference report.

Mr. BANKHEAD. How long does the Senator think it will take?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. About five minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well. I ask unanimous consent that the Post Office appropriation bill may be temporarily laid aside for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Post Office appropriation bill will be temporarily laid aside for the purpose indicated by the Senator from Georgia.

## SALARIES OF JUDGES—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the conference report on House bill 12001 be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the conference report referred to by the Senator from Georgia, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12001) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 7.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 3. That the judges of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia shall receive salaries the same as salaries provided by this act to be paid to judges of district courts of the United States, and such salaries shall be paid as now provided by law.

"The judges of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia shall receive salaries the same as the salaries provided by this act to be paid to judges of the Circuit Court of Appeals of



the United States, and such salaries shall be paid as now provided by law."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 5. That the judges of the United States Court of Customs Appeals shall receive salaries equal in amount to the salaries provided by this act to be paid judges of the Circuit Court of Appeals of the United States, payable monthly from the Treasury."

And the Senate agree to the same.

HOKE SMITH,  
WILLIAM H. KING,  
J. O. WOLCOTT,  
FRANK B. BRANDEGEE,  
LEBARON B. COLT,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

E. Y. WEBB,  
C. C. CARLIN,  
H. J. STEELE,  
A. J. VOLSTEAD,  
GEORGE S. GRAHAM,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

#### THE CENSUS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me, in order that I may make a motion in reference to the conference report on the so-called census bill heretofore submitted by me?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield to the Senator from Texas for that purpose, if it will take only a few minutes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. A few days ago I submitted the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11984) to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses. I now ask unanimous consent to withdraw that report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report is withdrawn.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask that the action of the House of Representatives on the census bill be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11984) to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, receding from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12 to the bill, and agreeing to the same with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; further insisting upon its disagreement to the remainder of the amendments to the bill, and requesting a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I move that the Senate still further insist upon its amendments and agree to the further conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. ASHURST, and Mr. LA FOLLETTE conferees at the further conference on the part of the Senate.

#### POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, before the Senate proceeds with the consideration of the pending bill I think I can make a statement which perhaps will facilitate that consideration.

It will be observed that quite a number of changes have been made in the figures as printed in the bill. That is made necessary by reason of the fact that the House of Representatives in passing the bill made its estimates upon the basic law without reference to increases which have been made, and when the House came to run out its figures and make its totals there was a failure to carry out the figures which should have been

carried out in order to meet the appropriations. Therefore the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads on the part of the Senate had to correct those figures, and they are indicated in the bill. I make the statement in order that Senators may understand why it is that, as I have said, there are so many changes in the figures as presented in the House bill.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Alabama what increases were allowed by the committee in the case of carriers and clerks of post offices?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The increase is the same as that contained in the bill of last year, \$200, and the bill restores automatic promotions.

#### IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC ROADS AND HIGHWAYS.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, there is a provision in the bill to increase the appropriation for good roads, to which I desire to address myself for a few moments.

Mr. President, there is no question pending in America to-day more important to the well-being and development of her people than the improvement of public roads and highways. I have always considered this as the most paramount of our unsolved practical problems. One of the first measures introduced by me when I became a Member of the Senate in 1911 was a bill to extend over a period of five years an appropriation by the Federal Government to aid the several States in the construction and improvement of their public roads. Upon the presentation of this bill I made a very extended speech urging Federal aid to road improvement and pointing out both the justice of such action and the great advantages which would accrue from Federal participation in road improvement. Those of us who were deeply and earnestly interested in this subject in season and out of season persistently continued our efforts and finally achieved success when the Congress, in 1916, enacted legislation extending Federal aid for five years to road improvement in the States. There is no act of Congress in the passage of which I actively aided and participated that I take more pride in than this piece of legislation. I was a member of the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee from which the legislation was reported to the Senate and a member of the conference committee which finally determined its provisions. We were content to commence with small appropriations until the Federal Government and the States obtained suitable road organizations and methods, thus insuring that the money would not be wasted and that its expenditure would result in substantial benefits. We expected when these organizations had been perfected that the Federal Government would largely increase these appropriations. We were satisfied that the great benefits accruing from the cooperation of the Federal Government with the States would be so apparent and so marked that there would soon be a demand for a large increase in the Federal appropriations. Our expectations have been fully justified. An impetus has been given to road construction and improvement which previously did not exist. The benefits from Federal aid have been so immense that the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture, under whose direction the expenditures have been made, have earnestly recommended the increase in the appropriations granted under this legislation.

The pending bill proposes to largely increase the appropriations granted by the Federal Government under the provisions of the existing law. I was a member of the subcommittee that examined the matter thoroughly and favorably reported this measure to the full Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the Senate, which committee, after hearing the report of the subcommittee, practically unanimously recommended the increases provided for in the bill. I had previously introduced an amendment to the pending bill carrying provisions substantially similar to these now reported.

The amendments contained in the pending bill increase the appropriations made by the act of 1916 to the extent of \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919; \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; and \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, making an aggregate increase over the amount heretofore appropriated of \$200,000,000. The amount expended out of the appropriations heretofore made is about \$75,000,000. This, added to the \$200,000,000 increase provided by the pending bill, will make a total of \$275,000,000 to be expended by the Federal Government up to June 30, 1921, toward aiding communities and States in the construction and improvement of their public roads and highways.

Under the method of distribution adopted Virginia would receive out of these appropriations up to June 30, 1921, the sum of \$5,458,162.37, to be added to a like amount from the State and local communities, to improve and develop her public roads. Thus, the practical effect of this amendment, if adopted, would

be to secure for road improvement in the State of Virginia to June 30, 1921, the sum of approximately \$10,900,000.

In addition the bill authorizes the Secretary of War to transfer to the control of the Secretary of Agriculture all available war material not needed for the present purposes of the War Department and suitable for use in the improvement of highways, to be used on the roads constructed in whole or in part through Federal aid. This provision, if enacted, will cause to be furnished immediately to the State authorities a large amount of road material and machinery which will be of inestimable benefit. This will make available a large quantity of valuable material and machinery that otherwise would be of little benefit to the Government and might ultimately be wasted.

Mr. President, there is no bill pending in the present Congress the passage of which I more earnestly favor than this measure, and none that I believe will obtain for the various sections of our country more beneficial results and advantages. The world is entering upon a great era of competition in production and sale of agricultural, mineral, and manufactured products. This future commercial competition will far exceed all such conflicts of the past. The nation that is best equipped will be better prepared to successfully produce and sell. The progress of this Nation in nearly all directions has been phenomenal. We are to-day the greatest manufacturing people in the world. The products of our factories exceed those of Britain and continental Europe combined. Our mines furnish the world more than one-half of its mineral products and wealth. Our plains and prairies are recognized as the granaries of the world. Cotton continues the king of plants, and the world's comfort and clothing are dependent upon the white fields of the South. We occupy to-day the foremost place in the world's commerce. Our exports now exceed those of Great Britain. Our wealth to-day far exceeds that of any other two nations combined. We have become supreme in finance, our banking capital and supply of gold being the greatest possessed by any people. In miles of railroads, navigable rivers, and improved harbors we are unsurpassed. We have shown recently in an amazing degree our ability to mobilize in a very short time a great army and navy, win great victories, and successfully conclude a world war. These are achievements of which any nation may well be proud.

Yet, Mr. President, with all these wonderful material advantages, it is admitted to-day that we have the poorest system of public roads and highways of any civilized nation. We have to-day, roughly estimating, 2,500,000 miles of highways in the United States, and of this mileage about 296,000 miles, or 12 per cent of the total, are surface roads. No other civilized nation possesses such a wretched condition of public highways. With our wonderful energy displayed in every other field of human endeavor, with our amazing wealth, there is no justification for such wretched road conditions. Our energy and our money have been generously expended in every other direction except in the betterment of our highways. After careful examination and thoughtful consideration of this subject, I am satisfied that our neglect in this respect has been one of the greatest misfortunes that has affected us as a people and should be remedied as quickly as possible.

No one can estimate the annual loss incurred by our people in traveling and hauling over these wretched public roads. Our internal commerce exceeds the interforeign commerce of the entire world. It is estimated that 90 per cent of our internal commerce must, first or last, be hauled over the public roads. The average haul of this vast commerce over the public highways, after a careful investigation, has been estimated at a little more than 9.4 miles. Careful investigation fixes the cost of hauling these products at 23 cents per ton per mile. The cost of hauling per mile over the splendid roads of France is, on an average, 7 cents per ton; the average cost in England about 11 cents per ton per mile.

If the more important and main lines of our public-road system were improved equal to those of France and Britain, it is estimated by good authorities that our products could then be hauled over our entire system of roads at a cost of 12 or 13 cents per ton per mile. A joint commission of Congress on Federal aid in the construction of post roads, of which commission I was a member, reported it was estimated that in 1914 718,000,000 tons of produce were hauled over our public roads. The amount now hauled over our public roads will exceed 900,000,000 tons each year. If our main lines were improved, as suggested, we would certainly save, under all conditions about 8 or 9 cents per ton per mile in hauling this immense tonnage, which would save in transportation cost over \$700,000,000 per year. Our loss in transportation over wretched roads certainly aggregates yearly this vast amount. In other words, the United States pays annually a mud tax of \$700,000,000. If

half of this loss was annually appropriated for road improvement for many years, all of our main and important lines of roads could be splendidly improved. We can not compete with other nations in the marketing of agricultural, mineral, and manufactured products unless we promptly remedy the seriously wretched condition of our highways.

But the foregoing does not include all of the loss occasioned this country by its bad country roads. The poor condition of the highways renders it impossible to market much of the products of the farm. When the cost of transportation and the cost of production exceed the selling price it is impossible for the producer to dispose of his products at a profit; hence production is arrested. In many sections farmers fail to raise certain important crops because the cost of hauling them over miserable country roads is so great that they sustain loss instead of profit. It has been estimated that more than one-third of our perishable foodstuffs never reach the consumers on account of bad roads. This country sustains a loss of many, many million dollars each year, to both producer and consumer, on account of this wretched condition. Our bad roads have also made it impossible in many sections to raise a great diversification of crops, such as is done in France and England, with their splendid road system.

Another great detriment to this country which has resulted from its miserable country roads is the forcing of the people to leave the rural sections and congregate in towns and cities. This fact is strikingly disclosed by the census returns. In 1790 only 3.4 per cent of our population dwelt in cities. In 1910, 46 per cent of our population lived in cities. This explains why so many acres of fertile land remain untilled, while the city, with its insanitary and unwholesome tenements, is crowded with human beings whose standard of living and methods of life result in their mental, moral, and physical decay. Statistics show that wherever the country is blessed with good country roads the rural population is increased in number, in comfort, and in wealth. School attendance, with all educational advantages, accompany improved roads. Good schools and good roads go hand in hand.

We have in this country more than 400,000 acres of undeveloped and uncultivated lands, which good roads would make available and profitable for agricultural purposes. Good roads would bring to these sections thrifty and prosperous farmers, greatly adding to the national wealth.

The farmers of our country can not successfully compete with the farmers of other countries unless we improve their roads, cheapen transportation, and thus reduce the cost of production. In a few years we will have a merchant marine equal to that of Britain, which nation for many years has had a monopoly of shipping. This will insure us fair rates from our ports and enable our products to reach all the markets of the world; but this great advantage will almost be destroyed unless we build good roads and lessen the cost of transportation from the farm to the depot, river, or port. Water transportation had so decreased prior to the beginning of the recent war that it cost the farmer 1.6 cents less to ship a bushel of wheat from New York to Liverpool, a distance of 3,100 miles, than it did to haul that bushel of wheat 9.4 miles, the average haul from his barn to the depot. We can not expect our farmers to sell their products of their farms in the markets of the world unless we reduce the cost of transportation by the improvement of our roads.

Mr. President, in addition to this, justice and fair dealing to the farmer demand that the Federal Government should extend him generous aid in road improvement. Next to our brave and gallant soldiers and sailors, no class of our citizens are more deserving of commendation for winning the great war in which we were engaged than the farmers.

The Government told him that our allies were destitute of food, that the world was confronted with starvation, and that our military success was dependent upon his energy and efforts. What the farmer accomplished can not be told in mere figures, but some conception may be had when I tell you that during 1917, the first year of the war, he increased the acreage of farm crops 22,000,000 acres over that of 1916, and not content with this great showing, added another 6,000,000 acres in 1918. During the two years of war the average yield of cereals was 5,717,000,000 bushels as compared with 4,719,000 bushels in 1916, or nearly 1,000,000,000 bushels increase. Over the wretched highways of this country last year the farmer moved more than 4,000,000,000 pounds of food, his patriotic response to the call for a supreme effort that our armies in Europe, our allies, and ourselves might be fed. How wonderful is this achievement when we consider that in doing all this the American farmer was handicapped by shortage of fertilizer for his land, by isolation from markets and shipping points, due to bad roads, made doubly trying by the hardest winter of the past quarter cen-



tury, and, finally, that he had to do this great task almost single handed, because his hired men and his able-bodied sons were at the front in France. It is a record of patriotic work of which the farmer may indeed be proud and which entitles him to every consideration at the hands of his Government. It should compel his Government to fulfill faithfully every promise made him and to extend in the future every generous aid and assistance to him. This wonderful achievement not only entitles the farmer to every consideration at the hands of the National Government, but it demonstrates conclusively the vital part which farm life plays in the welfare of the Nation and of the world and makes clear our duty to do everything possible to foster and protect this great industry upon which our existence depends. The best assistance we can now render him is prompt and generous national aid in road construction and improvement.

Mr. President, the travel over our highways at the present time is national, State, and local. It is not just to expect local communities to construct and maintain roads over which the travel of State and Nation far exceeds the local traffic. It is utterly impossible for local communities to bear the expense of constructing macadam or hard-surface roads. To do so would require such heavy taxes as to practically bankrupt the local communities. A system must be devised whereby this expense can be fairly distributed. The only way in which this can be accomplished is by the appropriation of money out of the State and National treasuries. By this means the cities and rich communities are enabled to share with the country sections their full burden of road construction and improvement. Since both country and city receive benefits alike from good roads, each should share the burden.

The Federal Government is further interested in good road improvement, since it can more cheaply and more efficiently carry its mails and parcel post over good roads than bad. I believe the cost of carrying the mails in rural sections will be reduced more than one-third when this country possesses good country roads.

Besides, the large appropriations contained in the pending measure will do something tangible and helpful in the giving of employment to our returning soldiers and sailors and the men temporarily out of employment by reason of the transition from war to peace conditions. A better time could not be selected for the institution of a vigorous and generous system of road improvement than the present. Let me also suggest that the Government in aiding in building roads will be engaged in a definite and useful enterprise very much needed and of primary importance, even if the question of keeping labor employed is left entirely out of consideration. I commend this sort of an enterprise to the Members of the Senate as much more worthy of support than any miscellaneous and aimless appropriations of money for public works solely to keep labor employed. In the one case we are working for a purpose—a purpose which contemplates permanent results; in the other case we are working to a palliative, a temporary makeshift undertaking. Road building will employ directly a large number of men and these men will, for the most part, be unskilled laborers—those whom it is hardest to place in times of widespread unemployment. It is a conservative estimate to say that at least half of the total amount expended for highway construction goes for the direct employment of labor.

Mr. President, the passage of this bill, with the amendments contained therein for Federal aid in road construction and improvement, will mark a great epoch in the history of this Nation. It will indicate a determination by the Federal Government to bear its fair share of the burden of improving our public roads and will mark the beginning of the end of bad roads in this country. It will open a new chapter in our history, each leaf of which, when turned, will gleam with more happy country homes, better schools and churches, and larger and more prosperous rural communities. Imagination will be powerless to picture through the vista of coming years the increased health and happiness, the increased wealth and power, and the great moral and material advance which will come to this Republic upon the completion of a great national policy of road construction and improvement.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator if, in his address, he shows what have been done under the appropriations we have heretofore voted for this plan of road construction?

Mr. SWANSON. I have not made a detailed statement as to that, but that is set out in the report of the committee.

Mr. KENYON. Have roads under Federal appropriations been built under any plan or merely in a haphazard manner?

Mr. SWANSON. They have been built under a good plan.

#### GERMAN COLONIAL POSSESSIONS.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to occupy the attention of the Senate for only a moment, not to make an extended speech but simply to record early my protest—an easy thing to do, and generally a fruitless thing to do. But I do not propose to be caught by the law of estoppel.

I read in this morning's newspaper the following:

As the result of a private meeting to-day between Gen. Smuts and Col. House, virtual agreement has been reached on the troublesome questions involved in the insistence of Japan, Australia, and New Zealand that the conference confirm the secret understanding reached between Great Britain and Japan for disposition of the captured German colonial possessions.

Mr. Lloyd George spent most of the day endeavoring to persuade the British colonial ministers to recede from their position in favor of observing the secret arrangement.

In consequence of these occurrences it is not going beyond the bounds of probability to say that the principle of internationalizing the German colonies, with a future administration intrusted to governments designated by the league of nations, will be recognized by the peace conference.

It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of this outcome of the greatest diplomatic battle fought behind the closed doors of the Quai d'Orsay.

Mr. President, the first thing to which I call attention is the fact that these stupendous arrangements are being consummated behind closed doors, and that the American delegation have not only acquiesced in the proceedings being behind closed doors but that they are now engaged in confirming and sustaining secret agreements heretofore made. The vice of the secret meeting is beginning to reveal itself. It would have been bad enough if we had been compelled and had acquiesced in the matter of holding secret meetings for this particular conference; but it is going a long way for our delegation to engage, through secret meetings and private understandings, in the confirmation of secret treaties heretofore made, for the purpose of disposing of the most vital affairs of the different nations engaged in this late war.

Mr. President, while I do not, of course, know the local conditions which surround the delegation, I wish it were possible for the delegation once and for all to insist that without the maintenance in all of its integrity of the first of the 14 principles announced by the President it will be practically impossible to realize any of the other 13. If we concede that these matters may be arranged and consummated in secret, the principles announced in the other 13 propositions will never come to fruition as a result of the conference at Versailles. The President was quite correct in announcing his 14 principles, in announcing his first as precedent to all others—that it was necessary to arrive at these agreements openly, because without that program and that process of arriving at conclusions there it will be practically impossible to realize any part of the other 13 principles.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I do not quite understand the basis of the Senator's criticism of the procedure at the Versailles conference, wherein he complains that there is a lack of information; that the peace negotiations negative the promise made that there should be open diplomacy. Exactly what is being done and the steps which are being taken are not only revealed to the country from day to day by the very newspaper from which the Senator has just read, but dispatches containing similar information are doubtless sent throughout the world each day. As a result, from day to day we know precisely the steps that are being taken by the respective parties in attendance upon the peace conference in their efforts to agree upon terms of peace. Obviously, the Senator would not require that Col. House or other representative of our Government and representatives of other nations should conduct all of their conversations, all preliminary talks and negotiations, in the open, upon the housetops, and in the presence of the representatives of the press of the world. There must be of necessity private conversations and informal discussions between the various representatives, which if open to all would inevitably lead to strife and jealousies and misunderstandings that might work irreparable harm. Informal discussions between a portion or all of the peace delegates must be had, and publicity in all cases would defeat the ends of justice and provoke animosities and delay a final agreement. To present coherent and tangible propositions for consideration in the conference there must be preliminary discussions which, if conducted in public, might prove highly disadvantageous. A working program for the conference must be prepared—something concrete. The delegates can not profitably

proceed on masse without some plan or thought-out propositions to be submitted and then discussed, after throwing everything into the hopper, the propositions to be embodied in the peace treaty. It would not be the rational or the sensible or the proper thing to do.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, that is the argument for secret diplomacy which has been made for 100 years. There is nothing new or original in the proposition. Nobody contends that every particular individual interview should be held in the open, and I care nothing about individual interviews. What I contend is that when they are sitting as delegates, and conferring and agreeing as delegates, the same as we do here, their proceedings should be in the open, and we should not be compelled to rely upon the construction put upon the proceedings by a reporter. That is what we have here. We have no authoritative statement at all, and we have no details as to what were the considerations which led up to the final agreement or understanding, or what the obligations are. We are simply confined to what the reporter could gather from the conversations in the lobbies, and so forth.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHAFROTH in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. Have the terms of the so-called secret treaty between Great Britain and Japan with reference to the German colonies been made public?

Mr. BORAH. I have not seen them. They may have been.

If the Senator from Utah will take up, for instance, and read that which was given out authoritatively this morning, you get nothing out of that. There is no information whatever there; and you have to turn to that kind of authority which is no different from what the Senator or I would gather if we were about the hotel lobbies, and so forth, picking up this and that in the way of information. I maintain that the Senator can not regard that as in any sense complying with the first of the President's 14 principles.

What did the President mean when he said "open covenants, openly arrived at"? He knew precisely, and he was very careful to use language which would exclude a program which gave to the people who were to be bound by it nothing until the binding obligation had been entered into. Col. House does not state that this conclusion has been arrived at. Gen. Smuts does not state that this conclusion has been arrived at. No one authoritatively states it; but it is gathered there in the way of inferences, and so forth, and you call that "open covenants, openly arrived at"!

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho further yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. KING. I make bold to assert that there will not be a treaty of peace signed until the world knows every term that is to be incorporated in it, and they will know just as soon as any term is agreed upon; we will not have to wait until all of the terms of the treaty have been agreed upon.

It seems to me that the Senator is highly technical in criticizing the proceedings because of a lack of "openness." We know substantially everything that is being done. If any agreement has been reached upon any point we will know it.

Mr. BORAH. We will.

Mr. KING. It will be announced.

Mr. BORAH. Of course.

Mr. KING. It will be announced before it becomes binding upon the parties, because the reaching of an agreement as to one matter will not bind them to a treaty until the complete treaty or agreement has been accepted and submitted for their consideration and for their signatures; so that the Senator, I submit, will know as the proceedings go on from day to day just what is being done and what terms are being reached. So the conference and the proceedings proper are in the open. There is no secret agreement or term secretly agreed upon. We are advised when anything is agreed upon. If the Senator will pardon me with reference to another matter to which he referred, we have nothing to do with the agreements that were entered into between our allies when they were fighting with their backs to the wall against the most formidable foes that the world had ever seen. I do not know that it lies within our mouths to criticize England and France and Japan for any agreements which they made touching their relationship, and which brought them together in order to resist the great force that threatened their destruction.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator is digressing. The Senator from Idaho has not criticized Great Britain or Japan. It is none of

the business of the Senator from Idaho as to what Japan or Great Britain do. I am perfectly willing that, if they see fit, they may have their secret agreements and secret arrangements, and it is not my purpose to criticize it. I am contending that so far as we are concerned we are entitled to all the facts that make up the different steps in the program. We are entitled to them as the program proceeds. Public opinion is entitled to the benefit of the facts as it is concluding itself. It is no satisfaction for a people to know what a treaty is after all the different powers have agreed to it, and they thereby practically, if not technically, are bound by it. If the treaty should be agreed upon and brought out of secret and published, and it has been signed by all the different powers, the tremendous pressure which would be brought to bear to ratify it by reason of the fact that it had been agreed upon would be such that it would be impossible to overcome it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. KING. In order to make my position clear, may I propound a question to the Senator in the shape of a concrete illustration which the news this morning presents for consideration?

It is reported that some of the allied governments feel that the German colonies should be divided amongst them, and that they should have the power to govern and control them without reference to any league of nations that may be entered into. As I understand the press dispatches, it is the contention of President Wilson and others that the legal title—if I may be permitted that expression—of these colonies should vest in the league of nations, and the equitable title should vest in the various nations which might be constituted under the league-of-nations trustees, and given the power of administration.

Suppose that Mr. Wilson and others who share the views which it is reported he entertains should contend and argue with the various representatives in their hotels, in their meeting places or wherever opportunity afforded, trying to secure the acceptance of the views which he suggests, and, after a multitude of conferences and casual conversations and accidental meetings at which conversations occur, President Wilson should so impress his views upon the allied nations that they accepted them, and it was then in open conference stated that the allied nations had receded from the position which they formerly had taken, and were willing to accept the views suggested by President Wilson, and pursuant to that understanding a provision was prepared embodying the proposition that the league of nations should accept the trusteeship of Germany's colonies, and one of the allied nations was designated to administer them: Does not the Senator think that that would be open negotiation and open covenants openly arrived at?

Mr. BORAH. No; I do not; neither does the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Yes; I submit that I do.

Mr. BORAH. No. The thing that the Senator from Utah is doing now is emasculating the first point of the 14 principles without saying so. Now, there is no misunderstanding of this language. If the Senator from Utah and his friends are ready to abandon it, to renounce it, that is one thing, and there may be a good reason for doing it—that is, a reason satisfactory to those who are in favor of doing it. But it will not do, Mr. President, to contend that the statement which has been made by the Senator is in compliance with the principle which President Wilson has stated has been recognized and adopted by the different nations of the earth as a fundamental basis upon which to proceed to the realization of a permanent peace.

I do not care anything about a private conversation which takes place in a hotel or incidental gathering or anything of that kind. I am not speaking of that at all. I am speaking of those conversations or those proceedings which take place when as delegates they are congregated together, and met as delegates and acting as delegates, the same as when we are here in the Senate acting as the Senate. I do not ask, in the matter of publicity, that the private conversations of the cloakroom be made a part of the publicity or the public proceedings of the Senate; but when we are here gathered as a Senate, dealing with the people's affairs, everything that we do should be known to them; and it is the same way with the peace conference. When they sit as a peace conference, as a body disposing of nations and of territories, and placing obligations upon people which may lead to tremendous consequences and great sacrifices, those things should be unmistakably in the open.

Now, I ask the Senator in return a question. Does he think that "open covenants of peace, openly arrived at," permits of arriving at those covenants in secret meetings?



Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. KING. Replying to the interrogation of the Senator, I do not place the narrow and illiberal—and I do not use the words in any offensive sense at all—meaning or interpretation upon the words which the question and the former very able argument of the Senator would imply. I do not think that in order to reach covenants in an open way, every meeting that may be held by the delegates who may participate in the discussion should be or must be in the open. We legislate here, and many of the discussions of the committees relative to measures are in executive session, are not open. I understand that "open covenants, openly arrived at," means that the public, the nations involved, shall be advised as to those agreements before they shall become binding, before they shall be incorporated into a treaty of peace for the signature of the powers who participate in negotiating them.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah was of opinion a few minutes ago that I was indulging in a criticism of the delegation. If I understand the press reports correctly, or the attitude which the President has taken from the beginning, I am not in conflict with the President's views as to what should be done, or as to how it should be done. When they undertook to close the doors, and did close the doors, upon that conference, we were advised by the public press throughout the country that it was over the protest of the President; that it was not in compliance with his interpretation of the first of the 14 points, and we were further advised that from time to time he would keep up the controversy for open sessions until they were forced, and the people were given what he had promised them. I do not regard myself as in conflict with the President at all. I suppose, if the press be correct, that I am in perfect harmony with what he would like to see. I will venture to say that if we are to take the President's interpretation of this, as I understand it, the President of the United States has no conference upon this subject that he is not willing for the public to have.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS. Would the Senator from Idaho permit me to intrude upon him to the point of asking what is the particular thing to which he now addresses his protest? I was out of the Chamber, and am very much interested to know what is the particular thing against which he is protesting.

Mr. BORAH. I read from Mr. Oulahan's article in the New York Times this morning that Gen. Smuts and Col. House to-day at a private meeting had come to a virtual agreement on the troublesome questions involved in the insistence of Japan, Australia, and New Zealand that the conference confirm the secret understanding reached between Great Britain and Japan for disposition of the captured German colonies. It was that subject matter which I was discussing.

Mr. LEWIS. I thank the Senator for the information.

Mr. BORAH. Now, Mr. President, as the Senate knows, immediately after the President announced his policy of "open covenants of peace, openly arrived at," I expressed myself here upon the floor of the Senate as thoroughly in accord with that view, and I am so constituted that when I am once settled in my conviction that a principle is correct, it is difficult for me to modify my position, and I have not modified my views in the slightest. I think secret diplomacy is the nesting process by which the germs of war are retained in the social system from decade to decade and from century to century, and that the Senate of the United States, and the Congress, and the people of the United States, understood the President to be denouncing that system when he announced the first point of the 14 principles.

While I may differ with him, as I do with reference to the league of nations, I do not differ with him at all upon the first proposition, and I support him in it just as earnestly as I would oppose him if I thought he were incorrect in principle. The fact that he is the Democratic President cuts no figure with me whatever. In this proposition of open diplomacy he is representing a principle indispensable to the peace and security of the great mass of the people of the world. I therefore support him, as I have always done when I agree with him.

I repeat, as I said before the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] came in, if the President is finally compelled to yield upon the first point of the 14 points, the other 13 will be whittled away in secret arrangements and agreements which they

will finally consummate. A league of nations with an army at its command, with the infamous principle of secret diplomacy embodied in its very nature—could the human mind conceive of a more arbitrary and infamous institution among men? And yet a league of nations, with absolute open diplomacy, might be made a tolerable proposition.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHAFROTH in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. KELLOGG. I have not heard the entire discussion of the subject, but does not the Senator think that one of the worst aspects of this case is any proposition emanating from any authority for this country to enter into a partnership to control African colonies and operate them?

Mr. BORAH. Of course, I was coming to the particular step now taken, which, as I understand, contemplates the conference coming to this kind of an understanding, that the colonies will be transferred as to their legal title, as has been said here, to the league of nations, and then that the league of nations will select the particular member of the league of nations which is to oversee and to dominate or control or be responsible for a particular colony or a particular class of colonies. I wish that I had a copy of the last Round Table, published in England, in which there is to be found a very illuminating article. In that article they have already proceeded to segregate and separate the different colonies and to distribute them among the different nations for watching, and so forth. We have assigned to us Mesopotamia and some of the countries in that region, and we are particularly assigned Russia. The article goes on to say that the United States is in a better position to deal with the Russian situation—to bring order out of chaos—and to establish a sane and stable government than any other member of the league, and therefore, while we are to have a certain number of German colonies, we are to have thrown in, as a side diversion, the task of establishing order and sane government in Russia.

Those who heard upon yesterday the able address of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] will realize something of the task which has been assigned to the United States. What we are doing now in Russia would be what our boys might be called upon to do in Africa or Mesopotamia if it so happened that under this league of nations in the assignments we were assigned to the possessions which Germany now has in Africa and other parts. It is a matter of vital concern. So far as I am concerned, I agree thoroughly with the statement of the Senator from California yesterday that we should come home and attend to the affairs that vitally concern us here. I am utterly opposed to policing Russia, or policing Africa, or taking over under our control any part of the German colonies.

I want to read from a statement by the prime minister of Australia. Hon. W. A. Watt, acting prime minister, says:

The question of the disposal of Germany's former overseas dominions is now under consideration at the allied peace conference. I wish to state plainly the attitude adopted by the Government of the Commonwealth in respect to the Pacific Islands.

Shortly after the conclusion of the armistice both houses of the Federal Parliament unanimously carried a resolution "that the senate and the house of representatives of the Commonwealth of Australia declare it is essential to the future safety and welfare of Australia that the captured German possessions in the Pacific occupied by Australian and New Zealand troops should not under any circumstances be restored to Germany, and that in the consideration and determination of proposals affecting the destination of those islands Australia should be consulted."

The time for consultation having arrived, the Government should make its views plain. It is the desire and hope of the Australian Government that the islands of the Pacific formerly held by Germany and now occupied by Australian and New Zealand forces should for the future be controlled either by Great Britain or Australia and New Zealand.

In expressing this desire we are not influenced by an ambition to extend our territory, but feel that this free, young nation must safeguard itself against molestation. The only form of insurance which is open to us is government under the British flag, as the Commonwealth already governs a substantial area in Oceania adjacent to the late German possessions of New Guinea and Bismarck Archipelago.

We feel that success has attended our development of these islands. [Parts of New Guinea and the Bismarck Archipelago have been under the administration of an Australian governor general for four years.]

We must appeal to the nations who have to judge our claims. We do not seek to exploit the natives, but to develop the productive and industrial possibilities of these possessions for the future good of the present inhabitants as well as the safety of this island continent.

Many evidences have been tendered to the Government that this is practically the unanimous view of the people of Australia. I can only express the hope that the presentation of our case by Prime Minister Hughes will so influence the statesmen of the allied countries that Australia's position will be safeguarded.

Mr. President, Australia has her Monroe doctrine. She has here outlined it in this brief interview to the conference at Versailles. If we as a Nation, by reason of our membership of a league of nations, interfere with the Monroe doctrine of



Australia or the Monroe doctrine of Japan, as it has been established by our consent, or the Monroe doctrine of some other nation looking to the preservation of its integrity, how long will it be after we have entered upon that program, if we are successful, before they interfere with the Monroe doctrine of the United States?

So I am not only opposed to the manner in which these agreements are being made, the methods by which these understandings are being arrived at, but I am opposed to the United States assuming any obligation to control or govern or be responsible for any part of the German possessions. I am opposed to any scheme or plan which will keep our soldiers in Europe an hour longer than necessary to clean up this particular war with Germany.

#### LIGNITE COALS AND PEAT—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. HENDERSON. I ask the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who has charge of the pending appropriation bill, to allow it to be temporarily laid aside while I present a conference report upon Senate bill 3220.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will consent, provided it does not provoke discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKellar in the chair). The appropriation bill will not have to be temporarily laid aside, but the Senator from Nevada asks unanimous consent to take up the conference report. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to know what the conference report is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 3220) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make investigations, through the Bureau of Mines, of lignite coals and peat, to determine the practicability of their utilization as a fuel and in producing commercial products.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3220) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make investigations, through the Bureau of Mines, of lignite coals and peat, to determine the practicability of their utilization as a fuel and in producing commercial products, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 2 and 3, and agree to the same.

CHARLES B. HENDERSON,

T. J. WALSH,

MILES POINDEXTER,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

M. D. FOSTER,

OTIS WINGO,

E. E. DENISON,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. HENDERSON. I will state in just a word what the report is. The bill passed the Senate some months ago, last fall, and it included lignite and peat, with an appropriation of \$150,000. The House struck out peat and reduced the appropriation from \$150,000 to \$100,000. We have accepted the House amendment reducing the appropriation and they have accepted our bill leaving peat in, the two to be investigated with the appropriation of \$100,000 instead of \$150,000.

Mr. SMOOT. The other \$50,000 is to be appropriated later.

Mr. HENDERSON. Probably not. I do not know anything about that. It is not appropriated in this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I can assure the Senator that it will be appropriated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

#### PUBLIC BUILDING AT YONKERS, N. Y.

Mr. REED. I ask the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads to yield to me that I may submit a report from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will yield for that purpose.

Mr. REED. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds have had under consideration a bill that affects the post-office site at Yonkers, N. Y. There are some reasons why it ought to be acted upon at this time. On behalf of the committee, I re-

port back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 8828) increasing the limit of cost for the acquisition of a public building at Yonkers, N. Y., and I ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the existing legislation authorizing the acquisition of a public building site at Yonkers, N. Y., at a limit of cost of \$250,000, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to fix a limit of cost of \$338,500 for the said site, and the appropriations heretofore made under separate limits of cost are hereby made available for the acquisition of said site within the limit of cost hereby prescribed.

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, in his discretion, when said site shall have been acquired, to sell to the city of Yonkers, N. Y., for such price, at such time, and upon such terms as he may deem for the best interests of the United States, such portions of said site fronting on Buena Vista Avenue and Market Place as he may deem it advisable to spare for the purpose of widening the abutting streets, to convey said land to the city by the usual quitclaim deed, and to deposit the proceeds of said sale in the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, under the subhead "Office of the Postmaster General," on page 2, line 6, before the word "each," to strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$3,275"; in line 7, before the word "each," to strike out "\$2,400" and insert "\$2,625"; in line 8, before the word "each," to strike out "\$2,250" and insert "\$2,450"; in line 13, after the words "in all," to insert "including increases hereinafter provided"; and in the same line, after the word "provided," to strike out "\$783,700" and insert "\$878,000," so as to make the clause read:

For salaries of post-office inspectors: For salaries of 15 inspectors in charge of divisions, at \$3,275 each; 30 inspectors, at \$2,625 each; 20 inspectors, at \$2,450 each; 32 inspectors, at \$2,100 each; 20 inspectors, at \$2,000 each; 30 inspectors, at \$1,900 each; 30 inspectors, at \$1,800 each; 60 inspectors, at \$1,700 each; 60 inspectors, at \$1,600 each; and 65 inspectors, at \$1,500 each; in all, including increases hereinafter provided, \$878,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 6, after the words "in all," to insert "including increases hereinafter provided," and in line 7, after the word "provided," to strike out "\$134,000" and insert "\$151,500," so as to make the clause read:

For compensation to clerks at division headquarters, 15, at \$1,800 each; 15, at \$1,600 each; 20, at \$1,400 each; 30, at \$1,200 each; 10, at \$1,000 each; and 10, at \$900 each; in all, including increases hereinafter provided, \$151,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the First Assistant Postmaster General," on page 4, in line 18, after the word "postmasters," to strike out "\$35,000,000" and insert "\$36,500,000," so as to make the clause read:

For compensation to postmasters, \$36,500,000: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to readjust the salaries of postmasters at offices of the first, second, and third class, effective July 1, 1919, in accordance with the law in effect prior to the war: *And provided further*, That in making such adjustment no allowance shall be made for the revenue derived from increased rates on first-class mail.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 3, before the word "at," to strike out "50" and insert "60"; in the same line, before the word "each," to strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$3,250"; in line 4, before the word "each," to strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$2,700"; in line 15, after the words "in all," to insert "including increases hereinafter provided"; and in line 16, after the word "provided," to strike out "\$3,680,000" and insert "\$4,281,500," so as to make the clause read:

For compensation to assistant postmasters at first and second class offices, 5 at not exceeding \$4,000 each; 60 at not exceeding \$3,250 each; 10 at not exceeding \$2,700 each; 10 at not exceeding \$2,000 each; 15 at not exceeding \$1,900 each; 50 at not exceeding \$1,800 each; 100 at not exceeding \$1,700 each; 200 at not exceeding \$1,600 each; 215 at not exceeding \$1,500 each; 175 at not exceeding \$1,400 each; 360 at not exceeding \$1,300 each; 600 at not exceeding \$1,200 each; 550 at not exceeding \$1,100 each; 350 at not exceeding \$1,000 each; 100 at not exceeding \$900 each; 70 at not exceeding \$800 each; in all, including increases hereinafter provided, \$4,281,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 24, before the word "each," to strike out "\$3,200" and insert "\$3,500," so as to make the clause read:



Superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, superintendents of money order, and superintendents of registry, 10 at not exceeding \$3,500 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 2, before the word "each," to strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$3,275," so as to make the clause read:

Auditors and superintendents of mails, 15 at not exceeding \$3,275 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 5, before the word "each," to strike out "\$2,700" and insert "\$2,950," so as to make the clause read:

Assistant superintendents of mails, superintendents of delivery, and superintendents of mails, 25 at not exceeding \$2,950 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 8, before the word "each," to strike out "\$2,600" and insert "\$2,850," so as to make the clause read:

Assistant superintendents of mails, cashiers, superintendents of delivery, and superintendents of mails, 35 at not exceeding \$2,850 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 12, before the word "each," to strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$2,725," so as to make the clause read:

Assistant superintendents of mails, cashiers, superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, and superintendents of stations, 40 at not exceeding \$2,725 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 19, before the word "each," to strike out "\$2,400" and insert "\$2,625," so as to make the clause read:

Assistant superintendents of delivery, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of money order, assistant superintendents of registry, bookkeepers, cashiers, finance clerks, stenographers, superintendents of delivery, superintendents of mails, superintendents of money order, and superintendents of registry, 65 at not exceeding \$2,625 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 24, after the words "in all," to insert "including increases hereinafter provided," and in line 25, after the word "provided," to strike out "\$55,000,000" and insert "\$67,200,000," so as to make the clause read:

Substitutes for clerks and employees absent without pay: *Provided*, That there may also be employed at first-class post offices foremen and stenographers at a salary of \$1,300 or more per annum; in all, including increases hereinafter provided, \$67,200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 11, to strike out:

And to provide for the promotion of 85 per cent of the clerks in first-class post offices from the fifth to the sixth grade; and for the promotion of 15 per cent of the clerks in the sixth grade to the designation of "special clerk" in the \$1,300 grade; and for the promotion of 15 per cent of the designated "special clerks" in the \$1,300 grade to the designation of "special clerk" in the \$1,400 grade; and to provide for the promotion of 85 per cent of the clerks in second-class offices from the fourth to the fifth grade, and for the promotion of 15 per cent of the clerks in second-class post offices from the fifth to the sixth grade: *And provided further*, That there may also be employed at first-class post offices foremen and stenographers at a salary of \$1,300 or more per annum; in all, \$55,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, in line 19, after the word "act," to strike out "and also the act of March 2, 1907, classifying clerks and city letter carriers in first and second class post offices"; in line 23, after the word "That," to strike out "thereafter" and insert "hereafter"; and on page 12, in line 2, after the word "whenever," insert "practicable," so as to make the proviso read:

*Provided*, That hereafter the appointment and assignment of clerks hereunder shall be so made during each fiscal year as not to involve a greater aggregate expenditure than the sum appropriated; and to enable the Postmaster General to carry out the provisions of this act he may hereafter exceed the number of clerks appropriated for for particular grades: *Provided further*, That hereafter the 15 days' annual vacation allowed by law to clerks and other employees in first and second class offices shall be credited at the rate of one and one-quarter days for each month of actual service: *Provided further*, That hereafter whenever practicable in case of emergency or otherwise a substitute is available the postmaster is prohibited from employing a regular clerk overtime: *Provided*, That the number of clerks in the aggregate as herein authorized be not exceeded.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 9, after the words "in all," to insert "including increases hereinafter provided," and in line 10, after the word "provided," to strike out "\$61,800" and insert "\$71,100," so as to make the clause read:

For compensation to printers, mechanics, and skilled laborers, 22, at \$1,200 each; 4, at \$1,100 each; and 31, at \$1,000 each; in all, including increases hereinafter provided, \$71,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 13, after the words "in all," to insert "including increases hereinafter provided," and in line 14, after the word "provided," to strike out "\$1,912,500" and insert "\$2,200,000," so as to make the clause read:

For compensation to watchmen, messengers, and laborers, 2,125, at \$900 each; in all, including increases hereinafter provided, \$2,200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 20, after the words "post offices," to strike out "\$6,500,000" and insert "\$5,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

For temporary and auxiliary clerk hire and for substitute clerk hire for clerks and employees absent with pay at first and second class post offices and temporary and auxiliary clerk hire at summer and winter resort post offices, \$5,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 21, after the words "City Delivery Service," to insert "including increases hereinafter provided"; in line 22, after the word "provided," to strike out "\$41,000,000" and insert "\$50,500,000"; in the same line, after the word "Provided," to strike out:

That hereafter all days set aside by the President of the United States as holidays to be observed by other departments of the Government throughout the United States shall be construed as holidays within the meaning and intent of the postal holiday laws, and postal employees performing service on such holidays shall be granted either compensatory time off or pay for overtime.

And insert:

That hereafter all days, other than the holidays enumerated in the act of July 28, 1916, making appropriations for the Postal Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, set aside by the President of the United States as holidays to be observed by the other departments of the Government throughout the United States shall be construed as applicable to the Postal Service in the same manner and to the same extent as the executive departments.

So as to make the clause read:

For pay of letter carriers at offices already established, including substitutes for letter carriers absent without pay, City Delivery Service, including increases hereinafter provided, \$50,500,000: *Provided*, That hereafter all days, other than the holidays enumerated in the act of July 28, 1916, etc.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I wish to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to line 11, on page 14. It seems to me that the word "other" should be inserted before "executive," so as to read "and to the same extent as the other executive departments."

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think that word ought to be inserted.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 17, after the word "year," to insert "including increases hereinafter provided," and in line 18, after the word "provided," to strike out "\$74,000" and insert "\$94,000," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of letter carriers, substitute and auxiliary letter carriers at offices where City Delivery Service is established during the year, including increases hereinafter provided, \$94,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 3, after the words "Provided further," to strike out:

That not to exceed \$60,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be immediately available for the erection and equipment of a garage on the site owned by the Government in the rear of the main post-office building in the District of Columbia—

And insert:

That the Postmaster General is authorized, in his discretion, to contract for pneumatic mail tube service in the cities of New York, N. Y., and Brooklyn, N. Y., or for any portion in such cities, upon such terms as may be agreed upon, the cost therefor to be paid out of any unexpended balance of any appropriation for the Postal Service: *Provided further*, That the properties and equipment of the pneumatic mail tube service located within the basements and subbasements of post-office buildings in the cities of Philadelphia, Pa., Boston, Mass., New York, N. Y., Brooklyn, N. Y., Chicago, Ill., and St. Louis, Mo., be not removed pending further action by Congress, but without expense to the Government.

So as to make the clause read:

For vehicle allowance, the hiring of drivers, the rental of vehicles, and the purchase and exchange and maintenance, including stable and garage facilities, of wagons or automobiles for and the operation of screen-wagon and city delivery and collection services, \$9,750,000: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General may, in his disbursement of this appropriation, apply a part thereof to the leasing of quarters for the housing of Government-owned automobiles at a reasonable annual rental for a term not exceeding 10 years: *Provided further*, That the Postmaster General is authorized, in his discretion, to contract for pneumatic mail tube service in the cities of New York, N. Y., and Brooklyn, N. Y., etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead, "Office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General," on page 16, in line 13, after "\$1,185,000," to insert:

*Provided*, That hereafter the compensation for the carrier of mail on Lake Winnepesaukee from the post office at Laconia, N. H., who furnishes his own equipment shall be \$1,800 per annum.

So as to make the clause read:

For inland transportation by steamboat or other power-boat routes, \$1,185,000: *Provided*, That hereafter the compensation for the carrier of mail on Lake Winnepesaukee from the post office at Laconia, N. H., who furnishes his own equipment shall be \$1,800 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 22, after the words "*Provided further*," to strike out:

That out of this appropriation the Postmaster General is authorized to expend not exceeding \$300,000 for the purchase of aeroplanes and the operation and maintenance of aeroplane service between such points as may be determined. That the Postmaster General in expending the appropriation herein for aeroplane service shall purchase, so far as possible, the aeroplanes, motors, equipment, and supplies from the War Department and Navy Department when no longer required because of the cessation of war activities. It shall be the duty of the Postmaster General before purchasing any of such articles to ascertain whether the War or Navy Department has articles of the character described that are serviceable. And articles purchased from either of said departments, if the same have not been used, shall be paid for at a reasonable price, not to exceed actual cost, and if the same have been used, at a reasonable price based upon length of usage. Said departments are authorized to sell such articles to the Post Office Department under the conditions specified, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to deliver immediately to the Postmaster General 100 De Havilland four aeroplanes, 100 Handley-Page, 10 Glen Martin day bombers, all planes completely assembled and with the necessary spare parts; also 100 extra Liberty engines with spare parts, 50 Hispano-Suiza engines with 300-horsepower motors, and 20 Hispano-Suiza engines with 150-horsepower motors, the same to be out of any equipment that the War Department has on hand or under construction, the War Department appropriation to be credited with the equipment turned over to the Post Office Department: *And provided further*, That separate accounts be kept of the amount expended for aeroplane service, and that no part of said sums shall be expended for the maintenance or operation of the aeroplanes above directed to be delivered to the Postmaster General by the Secretary of War, but such machines shall be operated and maintained by the personnel of the Air Service of the Army, under the control and direction of the Postmaster General.

And to insert:

That out of this appropriation the Postmaster General is authorized to expend not exceeding \$850,500 for the purchase of aeroplanes and the operation and maintenance of aeroplane mail service between such points as he may determine. The Postmaster General in expending this appropriation shall purchase, as far as practicable, such available and suitable equipment and supplies for the aeroplane mail service as may be owned by or under construction for the War Department or the Navy Department when no longer required because of the cessation of war activities, and it shall be his duty to first ascertain if such articles of the character described may be secured from the War Department or the Navy Department before purchasing such equipment or supplies elsewhere. If such equipment or supplies are purchased elsewhere than from the War Department or the Navy Department, the Postmaster General shall report such action to Congress, together with the reasons for such purchases. All articles purchased from either of said departments, if the same have not been used, shall be paid for at a reasonable price not to exceed actual cost, and if the same have been used, a reasonable price shall be paid therefor, considering wear and tear and general condition. Said departments are authorized to sell such equipment and supplies to the Post Office Department under the conditions specified, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are hereby authorized and directed to deliver immediately to the Postmaster General, as he may request, and as hereinbefore provided, such aeroplane machines, supplies, equipment, and parts as may be serviceable and available for the aeroplane mail service, the same to be out of any equipment that the War Department or the Navy Department has on hand or under construction, the War Department and the Navy Department appropriations to be credited with the equipment turned over to the Post Office Department: *And provided further*, That separate accounts be kept of the amount expended for aeroplane mail service.

So as to make the clause read:

For inland transportation by railroad routes and aeroplanes, \$59,625,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$1,000,000 may be expended for payment of freight and incidental charges for the transportation of mails conveyed under special arrangement in freight trains or otherwise: *Provided further*, That out of this appropriation the Postmaster General is authorized to expend not exceeding \$850,500 for the purchase of aeroplanes, etc.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask that this amendment may go over until to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington asks unanimous consent that the amendment may go over until to-morrow. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will proceed with the reading.

Mr. NEW. I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment of the committee, but if it is to go over until to-morrow I shall withhold it until that time.

Mr. CUMMINS. It is understood that the amendment will go over until to-morrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has gone over until to-morrow.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I did not understand that it was to go over until to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so announced.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If we should be able to come back to it this afternoon, I would like to do so.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I would like to have it go over until to-morrow, because I did not expect the amendment to come up this afternoon, and I want to try to get an amendment drawn to cover the proposition.

Mr. BANKHEAD. All right, then; let it go over until to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that to be the request of the Senator from Washington. The amendment will go over until to-morrow.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 2, before the word "each," to strike out "\$3,250" and insert "\$3,550"; in line 3, before the word "each," to strike out "\$2,350" and insert "\$2,550"; in line 4, before the word "each," to strike out "\$2,250" and insert "\$2,450"; in line 19, after the words "in all," to insert "including increases hereinafter provided"; and in line 20, after the word "provided," to strike out "\$28,385,500" and insert "\$33,904,000," so as to make the clause read:

Railway Mail Service: For 15 division superintendents, at \$3,550 each; 2 assistant superintendents, at \$2,550 each; 15 assistant division superintendents, at \$2,450 each; 115 chief clerks, at not exceeding \$2,100 each; 432 clerks, grade 10, at not exceeding \$1,800 each; 1,922 clerks, grade nine, at not exceeding \$1,700 each; 375 clerks, grade 8, at not exceeding \$1,600 each; 7,703 clerks, grade 7, at not exceeding \$1,500 each; 952 clerks, grade 6, at not exceeding \$1,400 each; 1,737 clerks, grade 5, at not exceeding \$1,300 each; 2,721 clerks, grade 4, at not exceeding \$1,200 each; 60 clerks, grade 3, at not exceeding \$1,100 each; 4,066 clerks, grade 2, at not exceeding \$1,000 each; 1,164 clerks, grade 1, at not exceeding \$900 each; in all, including increases hereinafter provided, \$33,904,000: *Provided*, That railway and substitute railway postal clerks shall be credited with full time when deadheading under orders of the department, and the appointment and assignment of clerks hereunder shall be so made during the fiscal year as not to involve a greater aggregate expenditure than this sum; and, to enable the Postmaster General to reclassify the salaries of railway postal clerks and make necessary appointments and promotions, he may exceed the number of clerks in such of the grades as may be necessary: *Provided*, That the number of regular clerks in the aggregate as herein authorized be not exceeded.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, in line 8, after the word "clerks," to strike out "\$1,613,959" and insert:

\$2,689,931: *Provided*, That the act of August 24, 1912 (37th Stats., p. 548), amended by the act approved March 3, 1917, be further amended to read as follows:

"That hereafter, in addition to the salaries provided by law, the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to make travel allowances in lieu of actual expenses, at fixed rates per annum, not exceeding in the aggregate the sum annually appropriated, to railway postal clerks, acting railway postal clerks, and substitute railway postal clerks, including substitute railway postal clerks for railway postal clerks granted leave with pay on account of sickness, assigned to duty in railway post office cars, while on duty, after 10 hours from the time of beginning their initial run, under such regulations as he may prescribe, and in no case shall such an allowance exceed \$2 per day."

So as to make the clause read:

For travel allowances to railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks, \$2,689,931: *Provided*, That the act of August 24, 1912 (37th Stats., p. 548), amended by the act approved March 3, 1917, be further amended to read as follows.

And so forth.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General," on page 25, in line 16, after the word "devices," to strike out "\$420,000" and insert "\$560,000," so as to make the clause read:

For wrapping twine and tying devices, \$560,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, in line 17, after the words "District of Columbia," to strike out "\$2,435,000" and insert "\$1,500,000," so as to make the clause read:

For the purchase, manufacture, and repair of mail bags and other mail containers and attachments, mail locks, keys, chains, tools, machinery, and material necessary for same, and for incidental expenses pertaining thereto; also material, machinery, and tools necessary for the manufacture and repair in the equipment shops at Washington, D. C., of such other equipment for the Postal Service as may be deemed expedient; for compensation to labor employed in the equipment shops at Washington, D. C., \$1,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, in line 7, after the word "thereof," to strike out "\$55,445,000" and insert "\$68,800,000," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of rural carriers, substitutes for rural carriers on annual leave, clerks in charge of rural stations, and tolls and ferriage, Rural Delivery Service, and for the incidental expenses thereof, \$68,800,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. At this point I submit the amendment I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. Strike out the period and insert a semicolon at the end of line 7, page 28, and add the following:



*Provided*, That hereafter rural carriers assigned to horse-drawn vehicle routes on which daily service is performed shall receive \$24 per mile per annum for each mile said routes are in excess of 24 miles or major fraction thereof, based on actual mileage, and rural carriers assigned to horse-drawn vehicle routes on which triweekly service is performed shall receive \$12 per mile per annum for each mile of said routes in excess of 24 miles or major fraction thereof, based on actual mileage: *Provided further*, That hereafter the pay of carriers who furnish and maintain their own motor vehicles and who serve routes not less than 50 miles in length may be fixed at not exceeding \$2,250 per annum.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. WADSWORTH addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I will yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I was going to make some inquiry as to what this amendment would actually result in.

Mr. SMOOT. That was the object for which I rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SMOOT. I will yield the floor and let the Senator from New York make the inquiry.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I make that inquiry.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What is the inquiry?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I desire to have an explanation of the amendment, as to what it will result in, how many men are to be affected, and what its cost will be.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the Senator have reference to the automobile routes?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; to the horse-drawn vehicle rural routes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. This amendment simply restores the language of the last bill; that is all it does. It was omitted in the print of the bill with reference to the payment of routes of 24 miles and additional service of 24 miles, and we have simply restored it. The last amendment has reference to the automobile routes over 50 miles in length. It is the language of the last bill, except it does make an increase of 5 per cent, which was given to the other carriers.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, the \$13,000,000 increase asked for, or, to be accurate, \$13,355,000 increase, is necessary on account of the amendment which has just been presented by the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; this amendment does not increase the appropriation at all.

Mr. SMOOT. I notice it is for the pay of rural carriers and that the amount appropriated by the House was \$55,445,000, which is increased to \$68,800,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, those increases are all due to section 2, which includes a great many increases. For instance, that section increases the pay of the city clerks at first and second class post offices and the city carriers. That amendment was inserted in the other House. I do not think it ought to have gone in; but it did. It is the House proposition, and the increase in these figures simply indicates the amount which ought to have been put into the bill; but the House left it for the Senate to work out.

Mr. SMOOT. I really do not yet understand from what the Senator has said of what this increase really consists. It is—

For pay of rural carriers, substitutes for rural carriers on annual leave, clerks in charge of rural stations, and tolls and ferriage, Rural Delivery Service, and for the incidental expenses thereof.

For those purposes the House provided an appropriation of \$55,445,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the Senator from Utah let me explain that right here?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The figures inserted in the bill by the other House were for the pay of rural carriers on the basic law; but last year they were given a 20 per cent increase. The House, however, did not include that in this bill at all.

Mr. SMOOT. There is included a little over \$2,000,000 more than the 20 per cent increase in the House.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We only increased it this year 5 per cent over what it was last year. We did that because the House had increased the pay of city carriers and clerks in first and second class post offices by \$200, I think is the amount.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I understand that this covers—

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the Senator from Utah will turn to section 2 of the bill he will there find the basis of this increase of which he desires an explanation. Section 2 is on page 29.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it would take too much of the time of the Senate to read section 2 and figure out just exactly what it means; but I will take the statement of the Senator from Alabama for granted, and shall not detain the Senate any longer on the matter.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am quite sure I have stated it correctly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, on page 28, in line 9, after the words "third class," to strike out "and in communities adjacent to cities having city delivery, \$1,250,000" and insert "\$720,000," so as to make the clause read:

For village delivery service in towns and villages having post offices of the second or third class, \$720,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 10, to strike out:

For experimental motor vehicle truck service in such localities of the United States as the Postmaster General may select, the establishment and extension of such service, the purchase, manufacture, exchange, and repair of equipment, supervision and maintenance, and expenses incidental to conveyance and marketing of produce and commodities, \$1,000,000.

And insert:

That to promote the conservation of food products and to facilitate the collection and delivery thereof from producer to consumer and the delivery to producers of articles necessary in the production of such food products, the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to conduct experiments in the operation of motor-vehicle truck routes, to be selected by him. The Postmaster General is further authorized to conduct experiments in the operation of country motor express routes, which shall be primarily operated as a means of expediting the transportation of fourth-class mail between producing and consuming localities and shall not displace or supplant any existing methods of mail transportation or delivery. These two classes of experiments shall be conducted under such rules and regulations, including modifications in rates of postage and in packing and wrapping requirements, as the Postmaster General may prescribe, and to defray the cost thereof the sum of \$300,000 is hereby appropriated:

*Provided*, That mail other than that of the fourth class shall not be dispatched on experimental motor vehicle truck routes or on experimental country motor express routes unless the same can be expedited thereby in delivery at destination:

*Provided further*, That separate accounts shall be kept of the amount of all the mail of all classes carried on such routes. The Postmaster General shall report to Congress the result of such experiments at the beginning of the next regular session.

Mr. McKELLAR. At the request of the present occupant of the chair [Mr. KING], I ask unanimous consent that this amendment may go over.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well; let it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, in section 2, page 29, line 24, after the word "That," to strike out "on and after July 1, 1919," and insert "during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920," so as to make the clause read:

SEC. 2. That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, clerks in first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service shall be divided into six grades, as follows:

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this amendment brings up the question of making the present salaries of the employees in the department permanent. This amendment makes them simply temporary. I want to say just a word about this matter.

I think that these salaries ought to be made permanent. We have recently passed a bill, and probably very properly so—I am not criticizing it in the least—increasing very largely the salaries of our Federal judges, the necessity for such increase being brought on by the conditions that exist as to all salaried men in this country. We have recently passed other large increase, and we have made those salaries permanent—much larger or quite as large in proportion as the salaries that are here asked to be made permanent. We have recently appropriated \$100,000,000 of our money for looking after people in Europe and for looking after the interests of the packing people over on this side of the water. Under these circumstances, it seems to me, it is as little as we can do to make this legislation permanent for these employees of the Government. I therefore hope that this amendment will not be agreed to.

I call attention to the fact that on page 32 virtually the same language is used, also on page 33, and again in the proviso from line 17 to line 26 on page 33 of the bill. I suppose every Senator knows the question at issue. It is merely a plain question of whether we are going to make these salaries permanent. The other House provided for making them permanent, and it seems to me the Senate ought to agree to that proposition in common justice to these employees of the Government. I hope the Senate committee amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I hope the desire of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] will not be acceded to. The condition in the Post Office Department—as it is in nearly every other department of the Government—is chaotic. We

have made the advances in these appropriations temporary; and we have inserted in the bill a provision to create a commission to investigate the whole question of salaries in the Post Office Department, to undertake to equalize them, and to put them all upon a fair and a just basis.

I do not think this amendment ought to be disturbed. I think the matter ought to go along. Let us agree to the creation of the commission which is provided for in the bill; let that commission take up the whole question of salaries in the Post Office Department, go over them all thoroughly in every branch of the Postal Service, and equalize them. Some of them may be higher than they ought to be, and some of them may be lower than they ought to be under the conditions. Nobody now, Mr. President, can tell what the conditions are going to be a year from now. It may be then absolutely necessary to reduce some of the salaries which we have now provided for under the existing extraordinary conditions. I say, leave that all to the commission, and let them work it out. I hope, therefore, the amendment proposed by the committee will not be disturbed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think the amendment reported by the committee is a very wise one for this reason: The increases which have been given to the employees in all of the other departments of the Government have been what may be termed temporary increases. Last year the increase was \$120. The basic rate of payment was not interfered with at all; but there was a temporary increase on account of the conditions existing. If the legislative appropriation bill this year becomes a law, I do not think it is out of the way for me to say that so far as the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee have acted it is in favor of increasing the \$120 of last year to \$240 for this year. I have not any doubt the committee would absolutely refuse to consider an increase of all statutory rates of pay by \$240, to be hereafter paid, but it is left to Congress to decide what may be done under the conditions which may exist a year hence; whether the increase shall be \$120 or \$240 or \$360. That question is to be decided at that time. I see a provision is contained in this bill for the creation of a commission for the very purpose of examining into the whole question of salaries to be paid the employees of the Government.

As I said a year ago, Mr. President, there ought to be a commission appointed, and appointed quickly, to go into the question of the rearrangement of the salaries paid in every department of this Government. I assert that there are now some of the most glaring discriminations in the salaries paid in the different departments of our Government of which it is possible for the human mind to conceive. The quicker a commission is appointed to go into this question the better it will be. I do not mean merely to skim the question over or to make some report that a certain head of a certain division ought to receive an increase of salary because of the work that he may be doing at that particular time, but I mean that the investigation of such a commission ought to be so thorough that it would be acceptable to any man who made an examination of the matter; I might say that it should be just as thorough as if the Government of the United States were a great, big business concern, and the investigation was made upon business principles and not upon favoritism or upon political "pull."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I desire to ask the Senator from Utah a question. I understood the Senator a while ago to say that the Appropriations Committee had increased certain salaries?

Mr. SMOOT. Statutory salaries; yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Temporarily?

Mr. SMOOT. Temporarily; for this year.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Has the committee not also provided for the appointment of a commission?

Mr. SMOOT. It will provide for it if the House conferees yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I mean that the Senator's committee is in favor of the appointment of a commission to adjust this whole matter, is it not?

Mr. SMOOT. Absolutely; and I am in favor of a commission in this case to adjust salaries in the Post Office Department. I think it would be a very wise thing to do, to have a commission created, if the House agrees to the Senate provision and the Senate agrees to the action taken by the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. Then, of course, such action would cover all of the other departments of the Government.

I know it is said that perhaps this ought not to be done at this particular time on account of the unusual conditions existing in the United States; but I have had enough experience in my service here in the Senate to know that if the commission were

appointed this year, before a thorough examination could be made—and unless it is a thorough one it will be of no value whatever—conditions more than likely will be normal; and this is the time that we want to know just what to do in order that equal and exact justice may be rendered to all of the employees of the Government. Therefore, Mr. President, I really think that the amendment of the committee is a very wise one, and I hope the Senate will agree to it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I do not think it would be wise to legislate a permanent salary list, but for reasons somewhat different from that expressed by my associates. My objection is that, if we should do so, the permanency would end with the next fiscal year. The constant demand for increased salaries will find favorable response here just so long as there is any money in the Treasury to devote to that purpose, and to speak of a permanent salary list is to express a contradiction in terms; as a celebrated nurse in one of Dickens's novels said, "There ain't no such thing."

Mr. President, I am aware, and, of course, have been so ever since the war began, that the rise in the cost of living bears very hard upon the salaried elements of society. Their compensation being fixed and the price of all the necessities of life being in a state of constant upward progression, this class necessarily feels the consequences of the disarrangement more severely, and perhaps more generally, than any other class. The time was when the wage earner suffered similarly, but in these days of organization he has been able not only to take care of himself but to utilize the emergency by securing a large increase over and above the cost of living. Hence I sympathize very deeply with the demand of the salaried classes for additional compensation, notwithstanding the fact that the giving of it brings no relief whatever.

This bill provides for an increase aggregating \$12,500,000 over and above the amount provided in the bill of last year, which was in turn an increase over its predecessor, and that in turn contained increases over the bill which preceded it. I am not a prophet, and never pretended to be; indeed, it required no prophet at that time to predict that the relief sought for would prove in practice of no avail, and it did not.

Mr. President, you have probably noticed that every request for an increase of salary is backed by the enthusiastic approval of the press, by the commercial bodies, by the landlords, by the grocers, and by the dry-goods people. Why? Because they know that these increases will bring a profit to them and to nobody else. The Government clerk becomes merely a conduit through which the money of the United States passes from its Treasury to the purveyor. So it has been, so it is, and so it ever will be.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Assuming that that is the case, should that prevent us from giving to the clerk, through whom it is conveyed, a living wage?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will only define what is a "living wage," I would be better able to answer his question.

Mr. McKELLAR. With the ordinary expenses that I have upon me I find that \$7,500 quickly disappears in this city, and I wonder how the clerks with such small salaries get along at all.

Mr. THOMAS. That is undoubtedly true; and if the Senator were receiving \$10,000 a year he would find himself in the same condition.

Mr. McKELLAR. On that theory, then, we had better cut all salaries down to nothing.

Mr. THOMAS. It would be just as logical and just as efficient. Why, Mr. President, the business of extorting money—perhaps I use too strong an expression—the business of securing money for the necessities of life from the salaried class has developed into an exact science.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am obliged to agree with the Senator about that.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator, who gets \$7,500 a year, finds that it costs him at least that to live here. If he only got \$1,200, the purveyors would still accommodate him, or attempt to do so; but I have not a particle of doubt that if the Congress should seriously consider the propriety of advancing the salaries of its Members to \$10,000 every landlord, the proprietor of every department store, and the proprietor of every grocery store would hail it with great satisfaction; in fact, with unalloyed enthusiasm, because they would see an additional \$2,500 apiece for something over 425 Members of Congress for their annual incomes. I am in favor of fixing a living wage if it were possible, but it is not. No man can obtain a salary raise fast enough to catch up with, to say nothing about overtaking, those who fur-



nish the supplies of life. For that reason I have opposed the raising of these salaries, because the recipients of them are just as well off as they are after this money has been appropriated from the Treasury.

There is a way of meeting it, in my judgment. I think the Government should provide, even though it may result in a deficit or in added public expense, a rate for shelter by furnishing the shelter and a rate for the necessities of life by furnishing the necessities of life under a living wage, and then pay that wage. The Government would not lose anything like as much as it does under the prevailing system. Talk about a permanent wage scale! It is impossible.

This is a real need; I recognize that; but a year from now the need will be just as real, and we will have to give just as much more, because, to use an expression I once heard used by a prominent business man here, the slack will be taken up long before Congress makes another appropriation. So that the whole business, Mr. President, of increasing salaries consists of a losing race between the salary earner and the purveyor; and, of course, there is an added incentive to the purveyor to increase his prices, because he knows from experience that we will meet the increase by giving the employee a little more. He can deprive the wage earner or the receiver of the salary during the next fiscal year of the benefit of the increase.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The natural effect of the bill which we passed the other day appropriating \$100,000,000 to European sufferers is to keep up the price of meat nearly to the present standard. This was admitted by Senators upon this floor.

Mr. THOMAS. I think so; but the prices will stay up anyhow—certainly in the District of Columbia.

Mr. McKELLAR. That bill has the effect of increasing the price of meat. Having enacted that legislation, does the Senator think it would be unfair, looked at even from his standpoint, to give the very poorly paid Government clerks sufficient salary to enable them to get meat at the price to which we have seen fit to increase it?

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator can not reproach me for the \$100,000,000 legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am delighted to know that I can not.

Mr. THOMAS. I did not vote for it, and if there is anything wrong in its enactment my conscience is clear.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not reproaching the Senator for it; I remember his vote; but I was just asking how he makes his present reasoning jibe with that bill?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not want to leave that statement incomplete. Because of the exigency I would have voted for it if I had thought we had the constitutional power to enact it; but I can never understand why, if the Congress appropriates \$100,000,000 for one purpose, that is a justification, or even an excuse, for appropriating millions of dollars for some other purpose. I know that the precedents are established, and that in consequence of them we are multiplying our expenditures very rapidly, so that now we are making appropriations by millions upon millions, and the Almighty Himself can hardly predict what the total will be between now and the 4th of March.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, perhaps the Senator misunderstands my position. I will say that my proposition is that if by legislation we have kept up the price of meat—the meat which the Government clerks must have upon which to live—it is absolutely right that we should also place their salaries at such a rate that they can get meat occasionally.

Mr. THOMAS. The sum of \$100,000,000 is very large in the abstract, but it is relatively very small in the effect that it will have upon the price of commodities in this country; it is not a drop in the bucket, so to speak. Moreover, prices are sustained in these days not so much by the demand for the commodity as by the control of the product. I do not think that the purchase by the Government of \$100,000,000 worth of foodstuffs, which must be made in large part from those having control of them, will sensibly affect the current prices for these commodities. But whether that be true or not, I can perceive no argument whatever in the proposition that because large sums of money have been appropriated for one purpose, the indirect effect of that purpose will justify other large appropriations.

I might say to the Senator, to comfort him, that my opposition to this measure is the very surest way to make it effective, for I am not sensible yet of having ever opposed successfully an appropriation in the Senate of the United States, and I do not know that I ever shall. I will say very frankly that this appropriation has the merit of necessity behind it, my objection being that it will not accomplish the purpose that its advocates seem to think. If I thought it would, I would vote for it in a moment, but sad experience tells me that we are merely by these

indirect processes furnishing money to those who do not need any assistance from us.

We have expended a great deal of money here in the District in the building of public structures for the sheltering of employees of the Government. I do not know whether they are occupied yet or not. I think it is a good start in the proper direction; and if we will follow it up by provisioning these places and bringing the cost of livelihood down where it ought to be, we will not only by that means confer a boon upon the public officials, but we will also sensibly affect the price of the necessities of life to the residents of this District. That, however, is perhaps too obvious a method of proceeding to justify its successful consideration by the Congress.

This will go through; there is no doubt about it; but do not try to make it permanent, because it is simply a waste of time and a waste of breath. It will be as temporary as the bill itself, to be followed next year by appropriations of similar, if not greater, increases to meet the added cost of living; and the local press and the purveyors, as usual, will be behind that with all their energy and all their enthusiasm, shedding crocodile tears over the terrible condition of the poor wage earner, but having their claws extended in anticipation of the harvest that is to come to them when the bill becomes a law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SWANSON in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

#### CARE OF SOLDIERS WHEN TRAVELING.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I apologize for calling the attention of the Senate to a matter which is extraneous to the pending bill, but there seems to me to be no subject that is more worthy of our immediate consideration at any time than this.

I ask the Secretary to read from the desk a communication which I have received from the chairman of the Red Cross Chapter of Parkersburg, W. Va.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

WOOD COUNTY (W. VA.) CHAPTER,  
THE AMERICAN RED CROSS,  
Parkersburg, W. Va., January 28, 1919.

HON. HOWARD SUTHERLAND,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At a conference of the chairman and other members of the canteen committee of our local chapter of the American Red Cross it was decided that I should most earnestly call attention to the proper authorities of the Government to the lack of care being given wounded soldiers transported via Parkersburg.

Complaints are made from time to time of lack of water, heat, and proper food on the trains. During this month the canteen here has furnished 5,150 men with some character of food and refreshment. There is a lack of system and uniformity with reference to the arrangements, and therefore a great deal of confusion exists, and the canteen is being called upon to bear expenses out of all proportion to the size of our chapter and the condition of our treasury.

We think that the Government should provide some character of service on hospital trains which would insure wounded soldiers having proper food and nourishment, without depending solely on canned food and canteen service. If the canteen, however, is expected to furnish meals and food in the amount which we are now doing, some provision should be made for compensation. It is true that occasionally officers reimburse the canteen, but there is no system or uniformity with regard to the matter.

We respectfully request information as to the policy and practice of the Government with reference to these matters, and in our particular case we would like to have telegraphic information in advance what character of food is desired, whether or not soldiers have equipment, and general instructions. We likewise feel that a train should be in charge of some one responsible officer or person. Our present experience is that at times Young Men's Christian Association men are seemingly in charge, and in one instance, particularly, our experience was extremely disagreeable. It is probable the Government has definite rules with reference to these matters, but if so they are not being carried out, and in very few instances has the canteen been reimbursed for any outlay which it has made.

Referring again to the cost which we are undergoing, our budget provides \$100 a month for canteen work, and it can be readily seen that to carry out the work as we are now being compelled to do is absolutely out of the question.

Very truly,

JOHN MARSHALL,  
Chairman Wood County Chapter,  
American Red Cross.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, it seems that soldiers are being transported to and fro over our railroad systems, particularly those now returning from Europe, many of them wounded soldiers, without adequate preparation being made en route for their care and feeding. It seems to me that this is a situation that should not exist. It seems to me that to require the communities through which these soldiers pass to provide for the food and care of these men as they pass through the several stations en route to their final destination is an injustice which this Government should not contemplate. We have appropriated, and are appropriating, large sums of money for the support of the War Department, and the virtual quartering of



these soldiers upon these communities in time of peace is an injustice which is not contemplated even by the Constitution, and which is practically prohibited. It is not exactly a quartering, but it is virtually a quartering upon the population of soldiers in time of peace.

It would seem to me that those in the War Department in charge of the transportation of those soldiers should adopt some policy by which advance information could be sent to those stations where they are to be stopped for feeding, so that proper food can be arranged for; and this service should be paid for by the Government rather than by the communities through which these soldiers pass. It is most deplorable that these hospital trains, carrying wounded men from the battle fields in France, should be found to be absolutely lacking in the essentials for the comfort of these wounded men.

I desire to call the attention of the Senate, and not only of the Senate but of the country at large, to this question, which is no doubt pressing upon many communities besides the one which is immediately complaining in this case; and I desire particularly to call the attention of the Quartermaster Department of the War Department to the necessity of better arrangements for sending these men to their destinations over our railroad systems.

#### WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I have here a joint memorial of the Legislature of Colorado, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the memorial, in the absence of objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I object to the reading of the joint memorial at this time. I want to proceed with this bill and dispose of certain sections of it, and then I shall be perfectly willing to yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It will take me but a minute to do it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will not the gentleman permit it to be printed in the Record?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think it ought to be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator insist upon it now, or will he wait until later?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I am helpless. If I object to it going into the Record, the Senator will read it himself.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Certainly I can read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the memorial.

The Secretary read as follows:

(House joint resolution 2. By Mabel Ruth Baker.)

*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):*

Whereas Colorado has long enjoyed the help and counsel of its women in all matters of citizenship, and has by these years of experience demonstrated the benefits to be derived by equal suffrage; and

Whereas there is now pending in the Senate of the United States a constitutional amendment providing for national woman suffrage: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we urge the United States Senate to take up and pass at the earliest possible date this constitutional amendment, in order that all the women of the Nation may have the right of suffrage, which they have so completely earned, and the Nation have the benefit of their citizenship; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we commend our United States Senators and Members of Congress for the work they have done in behalf of the Federal suffrage amendment, and urge them to continue their endeavors until success shall crown their efforts.

This is to certify that the above house joint resolution No. 2 was duly passed in both the Senate and House of Representatives of Colorado on January 3, 1919, by the following vote:

In the senate: Yeas, 31; nays, 1; absent or excused, 3.

In the house: Yeas, 65; nays, none; absent or excused, none.

Respectfully,

HARRY P. MASON,

Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the fact that the one vote given by a senator against the adoption of that joint resolution was cast by a man who stated that he had no objection to the joint resolution itself, but was opposed to voting upon any joint resolution memorializing Congress.

#### POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will resume the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, on page 31, line 6, after the word "to," to strike out "\$1,700" and insert "\$1,800," so as to make the clause read:

The Postmaster General shall classify and fix the salaries of railway postal clerks, under such regulations as he may prescribe, in the grades provided by law; and for the purpose of organization and establishing maximum grades to which promotions may be made successively, as hereinafter provided, he shall classify railway post offices, terminal railway post offices, and transfer offices with reference to their character and importance in three classes, with salary grades as follows: Class A, \$1,100 to \$1,500; class B, \$1,100 to \$1,600; class C, \$1,100 to \$1,800. He may assign to the offices of division superintendents and chief clerks such railway postal clerks as may be necessary and fix their salaries within the grades provided by law without regard to the classification of railway post offices.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 1, after the word "That," to strike out "on and after July 1, 1919," and insert "during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920," so as to read:

*Provided further*, That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the compensation of each rural letter carrier for serving a rural route of 24 miles and over, six days in the week, shall be, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 32, line 4, it is proposed to strike out the words "and over."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, on page 32, line 5, after the words "shall be," to strike out "\$1,440 and \$24 per mile for each mile or major fraction thereof over 24 miles per annum, payable monthly"; in line 8, after the word "miles," to strike out "\$1,382" and insert "\$1,440"; in line 9, after the words "miles," to strike out "\$1,296" and insert "\$1,350"; in line 10, after the word "miles," to strike out "\$1,152" and insert "\$1,200"; in line 11, after the word "miles," to strike out "\$1,008" and insert "\$1,050"; in line 12, after the word "miles," to strike out "\$864" and insert "\$900"; in line 13, after the word "miles," to strike out "\$806" and insert "\$840"; in line 14, after the word "miles," to strike out "\$748" and insert "\$780"; in line 15, after the word "miles," to strike out "\$691" and insert "\$720"; in line 16, after the word "miles," to strike out "\$633" and insert "\$660"; in line 17, after the word "miles," to strike out "\$576" and insert "\$600"; in line 23, after the word "That," to strike out "hereafter" and insert "during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920"; on page 33, line 6, after the word "law," to insert "*Provided further*, That no office shall be advanced to third class by reason of the temporary increases herein provided: *Provided further*"; in line 8, after the word "That," to strike out "hereafter" and insert "during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920"; and in line 13, after the word "mentioned," to strike out "herein" and insert "in this section and certain assistant postmasters at first and second class post offices and certain supervisory officials whose salaries are specifically increased by this act: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to employees who receive a part of their pay from any outside sources under cooperative arrangement with the Post Office Department or to employees who serve voluntarily or receive only a nominal compensation: *And provided further*, That the increased compensation at the rate of 5 per cent, 10 per cent, and 15 per cent for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, shall not be computed as salary in construing this section. So much as may be necessary for the increases provided for in this act is hereby appropriated," so as to make the clause read:

Clerks in class A shall be promoted successively to grade 3, clerks in class B shall be promoted successively to grade 4, and clerks in class C shall be promoted successively to grade 5, at the beginning of the quarter following the expiration of a year's satisfactory service in the next lower grade. Promotions above these grades within the maximum grades of the classification may be made in the discretion of the Postmaster General for meritorious service. No promotion shall be made except upon evidence satisfactory to the Post Office Department of the efficiency and faithfulness of the employee during the preceding year: *Provided further*, That clerks assigned as clerks in charge of crews consisting of more than one clerk shall be clerks of grades 6 to 10, inclusive, and may be promoted one grade only after three years' satisfactory and faithful service in such capacity: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the compensation of each rural letter carrier for serving a rural route of 24 miles, six days in the week, shall be \$1,500; on routes 22 miles and less than 24 miles, \$1,440; on routes 20 miles and less than 22 miles, \$1,350; on routes 18 miles and less than 20 miles, \$1,200; on routes 16 miles and less than 18 miles, \$1,050; on routes 14 miles and less than 16 miles, \$900; on routes 12 miles and less than 14 miles, \$840; on routes 10 miles and less than 12 miles, \$780; on routes 8 miles and less than 10 miles, \$720; on routes 6 miles and less than 8 miles, \$660; on routes 4 miles and less than 6 miles, \$600. A rural letter carrier serving one triweekly route shall be paid on the basis for a route one-half the length of the route served by him, and a carrier serving two triweekly routes shall be paid on the basis for a route one-half of the combined length of the two routes: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, postmasters of the fourth class shall receive the same compensation as now provided by law, except that they shall receive 100 per cent



of the cancellations of the first \$100 or less per quarter: *Provided further*, That if the compensation does not exceed \$75 for any one quarter, fourth-class postmasters shall be allowed an increase of 20 per cent of the compensation allowed under existing law: *Provided further*, That no office shall be advanced to third class by reason of the temporary increases herein provided: *Provided further*, That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the increased compensation provided in section 2 of the act approved July 2, 1918, making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, shall remain the same for employees other than those mentioned in this section and certain assistant postmasters at first and second class post offices and certain supervisory officials whose salaries are specifically increased by this act: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to employees who receive a part of their pay from any outside sources under co-operative arrangement with the Post Office Department, or to employees who serve voluntarily or receive only a nominal compensation: *And provided further*, That the increased compensation, at the rate of 5 per cent, 10 per cent, and 15 per cent for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, shall not be computed as salary in construing this section. So much as may be necessary for the increases provided for in this act is hereby appropriated.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if there have been any increases in any of these salaries, except temporary increases of a certain per cent, so as to reach the same level of advancement that has been reached in the other departments?

Mr. BANKHEAD. All the increases that have been made in this bill are temporary. No permanent increases have been made.

Mr. KING. And what has been the general increase in salaries?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I suppose I might say the general increase has been about \$200.

Mr. KING. What is the amount of the appropriations carried by this bill in excess of the Post Office appropriation bill for the preceding year?

Mr. BANKHEAD. About \$40,000,000, exclusive of the good-roads item.

Mr. KING. And is that all in salaries, or are there other items?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Practically all in salaries.

Mr. KING. In view of the tremendous obligations which this Government has assumed, those paid and those unpaid, the difficulty that we will experience in collecting the \$6,000,000,000 which the present revenue bill levies upon the people, and in view of the fact that billions of dollars are to be met in the future, I ask the Senator whether he thinks we are justified in adding to this appropriation \$40,000,000 for one year?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think we are, under the conditions, so long as we are adding this amount to the pay of employees of all other departments of the Government.

Mr. KING. And what is added by way of appropriation for roads?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Two hundred million dollars in three years—\$50,000,000 this year and \$75,000,000 during each of the two next fiscal years.

Mr. KING. Has the committee having this bill in charge taken into account the ways and means by which the revenue is to be obtained to meet these rapidly increasing expenditures?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is the business of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate. They will attend to that.

Mr. KING. The Senator is of the opinion that the majority of us—those who do not belong to the Finance Committee—may devise ways and means of spending money, but the sole responsibility of devising ways and means of raising money will rest upon that committee?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Oh, we are all going to support the report of the committee when it comes in. So is the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Oh, obviously this Government will have to meet the expenditures which an extravagant Congress makes. We can not repudiate the obligations that will be incurred by appropriation bills of that character. It does seem to me, though, that somebody in this Chamber ought to be protesting against the extravagant expenditures that are constantly being made. I do not refer particularly to this bill, but to other bills. There seems to be no plan by which to conserve the resources of the Government, to cut down expenses; and we justify these growing expenses upon the ground that prices have gone up, and therefore we must increase the expenditures of the Government. It seems to me that we will have an empty Treasury long before all of these obligations have been met.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I hope to be able to proceed with one or two more sections of the bill to-night; and when we reach the good-roads amendment, which the Senator from Utah has in his mind, I shall move to adjourn until to-morrow. I just want to finish up the part of this bill which provides the

appropriations for the Post Office Department. There are only one or two more pages of it, on which there will be no trouble.

Mr. KING. I suppose it is futile to attempt any emendation of this bill. I know how obnoxious a Senator makes himself if he opposes an appropriation. I have seen the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] and others who have tried to effectuate reforms run over by this juggernaut time and time again. I suppose the prostrate forms of these undying heroes will be found occasionally; but those forms will not even be reminders of the solemn duty which rests upon the Senators to try to have economical Government.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to say that there are some of us carrying recent bruises from the juggernaut car.

Mr. KING. I think that is true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, at the top of page 34, to strike out:

Sec. 3. That a commission consisting of five members of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the United States Senate and five members of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the chairman of the respective committees, is hereby authorized to investigate the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service with a view to the reclassification and readjustment of such salaries on an equitable basis; and said commission shall make a report with recommendation to Congress at the first day of the next regular session. The expense of such inquiry shall be paid from the unexpended balance of any appropriation for the Postal Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

And to insert:

Sec. 3. That a commission consisting of five members of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the United States Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five members of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, is hereby authorized to investigate the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service with a view to the reclassification and readjustment of such salaries on an equitable basis. Vacancies occurring in the membership of the commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments.

The commission is authorized to sit during the sessions or recess of Congress, to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to summon and compel the attendance of witnesses, and to employ such clerical and expert services and incur such expenses as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this investigation.

The heads of the Post Office Department, postmasters, supervising officials, and employees of the Postal Service shall furnish data and information and make investigations upon request of the commission.

It shall be the duty of the commission to report by bill or otherwise, as soon as practicable, the results of its investigation and what reclassification and readjustment of compensation should be made. The expense of such investigation shall be paid from the unexpended balance of any appropriation for the Postal Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, or for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and disbursed upon vouchers approved by the commission, which approval shall be conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Treasury Department. Funds necessary for the expenses of the commission shall become available upon the approval of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I believe we are about to begin the consideration of section 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). The Senator is correct.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It will be impossible to proceed much further with the bill to-night. There are a number of Senators here who want a morning hour. Therefore I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama withhold his motion?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I have here an address of about 10 minutes which was delivered by Mr. John L. Lentz, a former Member of the House of Representatives, at the Coliseum in Rome. It is a very patriotic address, and will occupy but a very small space in printed form. I ask that it be printed as a public document.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I move that it be made a public document.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has the floor.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I renew my motion that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 31, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, January 30, 1919.

The House met at 11 a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, infinite in all Thine attributes, gracious in Thine acts, generous in Thy gifts, make us more appreciative of Thy goodness and wonderful works to the children of men, and responsive to all that is good and pure in our being, that we may fulfill the duties and obligations of life this day and always, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## COMMERCIAL CABLE CO.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a short letter of 10 or 12 lines from the Solicitor of the Post Office Department, together with an attached letter from Postmaster General Burleson to Mr. George G. Ward, the vice president of the Commercial Cable Co., of New York.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks leave to print certain letters from the Postmaster General, and so on. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following are the letters referred to:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,  
Washington, January 29, 1919.

Hon. JOHN A. MOON,  
Chairman Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MOON: In connection with the letter of January 25, 1919, from Mr. George G. Ward, vice president of the Commercial Cable Co., to the Postmaster General, relative to certain orders received by that company from the war department of the British Government, which I understand has been put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I inclose herewith for your information, and in order that you may, if you see fit, put it also in the RECORD, a copy of the Postmaster General's reply to Mr. Ward's letter.

Very truly, yours,

W. H. LAMAR,  
Solicitor.

JANUARY 28, 1919.

Mr. GEORGE G. WARD,  
Vice President Commercial Cable Co.,  
253 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

SIR: Your letter of the 25th instant quoting order issued to your company by the war department of the British Government received. In reply to your inquiry with respect thereto it seems only necessary to state that the English Government is exercising control over the property of and persons connected with the Commercial Cable Co. located in the British possessions. And under the joint resolution of Congress this Government, through the Postmaster General, is controlling the operations of the cable properties within its jurisdiction. You have been relieved by me of all duties affecting the operation of cables of your company, so far as the jurisdiction of this Government is concerned over the cables of the Commercial Co. I have no instructions to issue to you in regard to any requirements that the British Government may require of you as an officer of the Commercial Co. as a corporation and relating to the property of the company or the conduct of its officials or agents located and operating in the British possessions and with respect to which that Government has assumed control.

Respectfully,

A. S. BURLESON,  
Postmaster General.

## IMMIGRATION BILL.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization may have five days within which to file a minority report on the bill H. R. 15302, the exclusion immigration bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the minority of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization have five days within which to file a minority report on the new immigration bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNETT. I would like further, Mr. Speaker, to ask unanimous consent that there be a reprint of 2,000 copies of the bill and report. It is a very important measure, and the number of copies now available is altogether inadequate.

The SPEAKER. How many did the gentleman say?

Mr. BURNETT. Two thousand.

The SPEAKER. That 2,000 copies of the bill, together with both reports, be printed as a House document. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand that the gentleman desires to have the bill printed in document form?

Mr. BURNETT. I simply wanted to have it available for the Members.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker included the bill in document form by inadvertence. The request is for a reprint of the bill and the reports. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for six minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for six minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Reserving the right to object for a moment, may I ask the gentleman to yield to me? I have a correction of the RECORD that I want to make.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will attend to that if leave is given to the gentleman from New York; and if not, he will attend to it anyway. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for six minutes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, several Members called the attention of the House yesterday to conditions at St. Elizabeths Hospital in Washington. I spoke to some of the Members who referred to the matter and their information was based upon articles appearing in one of the local papers and in a New York newspaper.

I went to St. Elizabeths Hospital yesterday afternoon and made a personal inspection of that institution. I know there are a good many Members who were quite concerned as to the nature of the reports made, and I want to say that, in my opinion, the reports appearing in the local papers and in the New York paper are not justified.

The St. Elizabeths Hospital is an institution for the insane. It is an insane asylum and a typical institution of that character. There are no shell-shock soldiers there at all. There are no soldiers there for medical treatment. Of course, some mental cases may also require medical treatment and they receive it. They are all mental cases. It is true that there are a good many mild cases there, but it is necessary to send them to some institution where they can remain under observation and later be discharged if they go back to normal condition.

Now, the only objection that might be found might be that it is improper to send mild cases to St. Elizabeths and keep them there for a short period. The answer to that is that we have no other institution in the United States where military mental cases may be sent. These cases have been through various local hospitals and have been under the observation of regimental and base hospital doctors, and owing to their mental condition are recommended for treatment at St. Elizabeths.

The new buildings, the pavilions erected since the war, are ideal buildings. They are one-story cement structures and they are up to date in every respect. Some of the older buildings were put up in 1855 and some in 1873. Of course, they are not as up to date as the new barracks and are rather gloomy. But I want to say this, that there is nothing at St. Elizabeths that requires congressional attention or is sufficient to warrant any uneasiness on our part.

Mr. SHERWOOD. How many are there of those soldiers?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There are 3,775 patients in all, civilian and soldiers, and about half of those are soldiers from all over the United States, at all times, all together, and there are about 1,400 soldiers that have been sent there since the war. These men have been dragged out of 4,000,000 men that we drafted. All of them are not from overseas service.

The food is reasonably good. It is the usual food of such institutions. I was there at supper time last night, and both the bed patients' food and the ward patients' food was substantial and the kitchen and the service clean.

Now, I want to point out to the House that the superintendent of that institution will have his hands full to-day and tomorrow and the next day owing to the reports that appeared in the papers. Every one of the patients that I spoke to yesterday referred to these articles in the papers. It is going to cause no little uneasiness on the part of those 3,775 patients that the superintendent and staff have on their hands.

We get all sorts of complaints here, and I think that when complaints come in, before we take them up on the floor, we might well go out and see for ourselves. I inspected one institution in New York recently and St. Elizabeths yesterday. There are a good many complaints coming now concerning Walter Reed Hospital. I would suggest to the Members to go there.

Mr. SHERWOOD. What is the nature of their complaints?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Of the Walter Reed Hospital?

Mr. SHERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The complaints about the Walter Reed Hospital are, briefly, that there are no laundry facilities for crippled men, that the food is not up to the standard, that they are crowded, and that there is insufficient medical treatment.

Mr. SHERWOOD. There are about 2,000 patients there?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not know. I have not been at the Walter Reed Hospital. I would prefer that some other Member



go there and see for himself. It is not necessary to get a resolution for a congressional investigation. We can go and see for ourselves. I have seen two of these hospitals, and I would prefer that some other Member go there and then come back and tell us about it. All of these institutions have a hard job on their hands at this time. If criticism is just, we want to get a remedy. If I understand our duty, it is not enough to get up and criticize. We want to criticize where criticism is deserved, and we want to discourage criticism where it is not warranted.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. LAZARO. What does the gentleman mean when he says Members ought to visit an institution like Walter Reed Hospital? How long would you stay there, and what kind of a visit would you have up there, in order to get the information?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I would do it in this way: A Member has eyes, ears, a nose, a mouth. He can taste the food, he can observe conditions, he can talk to the men, he can look around. I believe it is a good thing to do.

Mr. LAZARO. I agree with the gentleman about that, but the gentleman will admit that one would have to spend a good deal of time.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes, indeed; I work 18 hours a day, but I consider such work part of my duties.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a senate joint memorial of the Idaho Legislature, eulogizing the late Col. Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho asks to have printed in the RECORD a resolution of the legislature of his State eulogizing the late Col. Roosevelt. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has not this resolution been printed in the RECORD by action of the other body?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. No; I looked through the RECORD and found that it had not been printed.

Mr. MANN. It probably will be printed two or three times before we are through with it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The joint memorial is as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Robert O. Jones, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and complete transcript of senate joint memorial No. 1 (by Whitcomb), which was filed in this office on the 21st day of January, A. D. 1919, and admitted to record.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise City, the capital of Idaho, this 22d day of January, in the year of our Lord 1919 and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.]

ROBERT O. JONES,  
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 1.

To the Hon. D. W. Davis, governor of Idaho:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas the telegraphed announcement of the death of Hon. Theodore Roosevelt brings to each of us a sense of personal and general loss in the passing away of him whom we believed to be the greatest American citizen of his generation; and

Whereas Hon. Theodore Roosevelt, as a public official, a brave soldier, President of the United States, and, finally, as the leading private citizen of his country, has, through the force of his utterances and example of his life, been the chief factor in remodeling and reviving the plans and purposes of our Government and bringing home to its people more clearly the need for civic righteousness; and

Whereas the American public will hold his memory in grateful regard, we feel that the people of this State, in commemoration of the passing of this great American, will desire to show their sorrow and regard in a becoming way: It is therefore

Resolved, That his excellency, Hon. D. W. Davis, governor of Idaho, is hereby petitioned to declare, by executive proclamation, the day appointed for the funeral obsequies a public holiday, when all public offices shall close; and we express the hope that in this proclamation it shall be requested that business, so far as possible, shall cease for a time on that day, and that appropriate memorial services shall be held in the churches and schools.

Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Idaho is hereby instructed to present this memorial to the governor of the State, Hon. D. W. Davis, as soon as it shall have been passed by the Senate and House of Representatives of Idaho; and shall also be instructed to forward this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, and a copy of the same to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State. He is also hereby instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to Mrs. Theodore Roosevelt.

This joint memorial passed the senate on the 8th day of January, 1919.

C. C. MOORE,  
President of the Senate.

This joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 8th day of January, 1919.

M. A. KIGER,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within senate joint memorial No. 1 originated in the senate during the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

PAUL DAVIS,  
Secretary of the Senate.

LEAVE TO FILE MINORITY VIEWS.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Claims, I ask unanimous consent to file a minority report (No. 905, pt. 2) on S. 2885, favorably reported from the committee.

The SPEAKER. How many days does the gentleman want in which to file the views of the minority?

Mr. BLANTON. Two days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent for two days to print a minority report on S. 2885, reported from the Committee on Claims. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, further I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD concerning minority reports that I will file against claims which I do not consider meritorious.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on minority reports that he has made on certain claims. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the discussion which has taken place relating to St. Elizabeths Hospital, I do not know whether one of the difficulties out there has been the fact that they have detailed a number of soldiers to act as attendants at the hospital, men who have had no training, no experience with insane cases, no special knowledge regarding the care of insane patients. One soldier called on me here the other day stating that he had been detailed there as an attendant much against his wish; that he had no knowledge or experience relating to such matters; that he had been assaulted by insane patients, and was really in fear of trouble either to himself or to the insane patients with whom he might come in contact. I do not know the reason for this, but it strikes me as rather peculiar and odd that in an insane hospital supported by the Government, and heretofore, at least, amply supported by the Government, it should be necessary to detail private soldiers who have had no experience at all in such matters to act as attendants in an insane hospital.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

On motion of Mr. LEVER, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 15018) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill for amendment under the five-minute rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

Salaries, Office of the Secretary of Agriculture: Secretary of Agriculture, \$12,000; two Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture, at \$5,000 each; solicitor, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$3,000, and \$500 additional as custodian of buildings; private secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture, \$3,000; executive clerk, \$2,250; executive clerk, \$2,100; stenographer and executive clerk to the Secretary of Agriculture, \$2,250; private secretary to the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, \$2,250; one appointment clerk, \$2,000; one assistant in charge of information, \$3,000; one officer in charge of supplies, \$2,000; one assistant, \$2,000; one inspector, \$3,000; one inspector, \$2,250; one attorney, \$3,500; two attorneys, at \$3,250 each: *Provided*, That hereafter the position of attorney in the Department of Agriculture shall be and remain in the competitive classified civil service, anything in the law or in the civil-service rules and regulations to the contrary notwithstanding, and the law clerks now in said department who may be appointed or promoted to said positions of attorney shall retain all the rights of competitive employees, and the Secretary of Agriculture may detail said attorneys for service in or out of the District of Columbia: 2 law clerks, at \$3,000 each; 2 law clerks, at \$2,750 each; 4 law clerks, at \$2,500 each; 8 law clerks, at \$2,250 each; 1 law clerk, \$2,200; 5 law clerks, at \$2,000 each; 3 law clerks, at \$1,800 each; 2 law clerks, at \$1,600 each; 1 assistant editor, \$2,000; 4 assistant editors, at \$1,800 each; 1 assistant editor, \$1,600; 1 expert on exhibits, \$3,000; 1 assistant in exhibits, \$2,000; 1 telegraph and telephone operator, \$1,600; 1 assistant chief clerk and captain of the watch, \$1,800; 5 clerks, class 4; 14 clerks, class 3; 21 clerks, class 2; 27 clerks, class 1; 1 auditor, \$2,000; 1 accountant and bookkeeper, \$2,000; 1 clerk, \$1,440; 2 clerks, at \$1,100 each; 1 clerk, \$1,020; 7 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 18 clerks, at \$900 each; 2 clerks, at \$840 each; 14 messengers or laborers, at \$840 each; 12 messengers or laborers, at \$720 each; 1 messenger or laborer,

\$660: 1 mechanical superintendent, \$2,500; 1 mechanical assistant, \$1,800; 1 mechanical assistant, \$1,400; 1 mechanical assistant, \$1,350; 1 engineer, \$1,400; 1 electrical engineer and draftsman, \$1,200; 2 assistant engineers, at \$1,200 each; 2 assistant engineers, at \$1,000 each; 1 fireman, \$840; 8 firemen, at \$720 each; 1 chief elevator conductor, \$840; 16 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; 3 elevator conductors, at \$600 each; 1 superintendent of shops, \$1,400; 1 cabinet shop foreman, \$1,200; 5 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at \$1,200 each; 3 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at \$1,100 each; 9 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at \$1,020 each; 3 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at \$900 each; 1 instrument maker, \$1,200; 1 electrician or wireman, \$1,000; 2 electrical wiremen, at \$1,100 each; 1 electrician or wireman, \$1,000; 1 electrical wireman, \$900; 1 electrician's helper, \$840; 3 electrician's helpers, at \$720 each; 1 painter, \$1,020; 1 painter, \$1,000; 5 painters, at \$900 each; 6 plumbers or steamfitters, at \$1,020 each; 2 plumber's helpers, at \$840 each; 2 plumber's helpers, at \$720 each; 1 blacksmith, \$900; 1 elevator machinist, \$900; 1 tinner or sheet-metal worker, \$1,100; 1 tinner's helper, \$720; 1 lieutenant of the watch, \$1,000; 2 lieutenants of the watch, at \$960 each; 73 watchmen, at \$720 each; 4 mechanics, at \$1,200 each; 1 mechanic, \$1,000; 1 skilled laborer, \$1,000; 2 skilled laborers, at \$960 each; 1 skilled laborer, \$900; 2 skilled laborers, at \$840 each; 2 skilled laborers, at \$720 each; one janitor, \$900; 14 messengers or laborers, at \$600 each; 1 carriage driver, \$600; 8 messenger boys, at \$600 each; 24 messenger boys, at \$480 each; 1 messenger boy, \$360; 1 charwoman, \$540; 3 charwomen, at \$480 each; 1 charwoman, \$360; 15 charwomen, at \$240 each; for extra labor and emergency employments, \$20,000; in all, \$501,020.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina as to these numerous editors provided on page 3, lines 3 and 4. Are all of these editors provided for in the existing law?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; there is no change.

Mr. CRAMTON. And with the new publications that the department is putting out, which are very numerous, they have not increased the force of the department?

Mr. LEVER. I think not. Most of the editorial work is now concentrated in the Secretary's office, except the Bureau of Publications.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will yield, there is one additional editor provided for later on in the bill.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not informed how they are edited, but there is an increasing number of publications in all the departments. They have become so numerous in the departmental desire to give publicity that they are defeating their own purpose. The newspapers are so overwhelmed with them that they have no time to read them, and it has become a waste of paper and good printers' ink.

Mr. MANN. Does any gentleman in the House, or anybody else, know how many serial publications the Government is now conducting in the various departments?

Mr. CRAMTON. I started to make a collection of those that came to my office, but they came to me so fast and the collection became so voluminous that I had to give it up to make room for other things.

Mr. LEVER. I think there is a great deal of force in the suggestion that the various departments are flooding the country with publications so numerous that the people are not reading them. I do not know that that is true of the Department of Agriculture, because I think the publications have been very valuable the past year.

Mr. CRAMTON. I know that some of them are valuable; but each bureau is aspiring to get out a more pretentious magazine than the others, and the newspaper offices of the country are flooded with them, with the result that they are so numerous that they have no time to read them, and all go into the wastebasket. If there is any new editor provided for in this bill, I would like to make a point of order against it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman from Michigan permit?

Mr. CRAMTON. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the gentleman aware of the practice of one bureau in the Department of Agriculture furnishing to the newspapers of the country not only material to fill the inside—

Mr. CRAMTON. Boiler plate.

Mr. STAFFORD. Boiler plate, so that it can be printed in the weekly and daily editions? Can the chairman advise the House how much money is being expended by the Department of Agriculture for publications?

Mr. LEVER. I can not offhand.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the committee ever made any inquiry of anybody connected with the department in regard to it?

Mr. LEVER. Not within the last two years. The gentleman knows that there was carried in one of his bills an appropriation of \$600,000 for farmers' bulletins.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; that is for the use of Members of Congress, and those bulletins are distributed throughout the country and are a benefit to agriculture. But the gentleman from Michigan is directing the attention of the House to the practice of the departments, and this department in particular, in publishing serial magazines, furnishing articles weekly to

newspapers throughout the country and in going to the extent of furnishing so-called boiler plate for insertions in their papers.

I think some investigation should be made. We have a Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture. They have a clerk, but I question whether they have had a meeting during this Congress.

Mr. LEVER. That brings up the old question of the activities of the Expenditures Committee. I wish they would look into these matters. It is almost impossible for a big Appropriation Committee to go into all of these things.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman's committee could have made the inquiry of the chief clerk or somebody connected with the department and got that information.

Mr. LEVER. We might have done so.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think he could get the information as to how much money the Agricultural Department is spending on publications if he searched for a year?

Mr. LEVER. I think it would be difficult, but I believe we could approximate it.

Mr. MANN. You might guess at it. May I ask the gentleman a question? I see the bill provides for two Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture. We have had for a long time an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and I guess very capable gentlemen have filled the office. They have no duties to perform except to travel around the country and occasionally instruct the people about agricultural matters, generally not knowing very much about it themselves. What is the occasion of providing two supernumeraries over there instead of one?

Mr. LEVER. I hope the new Assistant Secretary will not be considered a supernumerary. The gentleman recognizes that the department has grown very rapidly.

Mr. MANN. I do know that the department is efficient, the bureaus are efficient, and the efficiency has increased in the past very largely by the fact that they are not interfered with above the chief of the bureau. The old Secretary of Agriculture, under whom the great developments took place, Mr. Wilson, considered it largely his duty to stand by the work that the chief was doing.

Mr. LEVER. I think that is the policy of the present Secretary, and yet the work of the office of the Secretary of Agriculture has increased enormously and the detailed work of the Secretary's office has grown so much that I am convinced as a Cabinet officer he ought to be given some time to think, rather than to be asked to fool with small details, and it was for that purpose that I was willing to consent, and the committee agreed to allowing an additional secretary, who may take some of the detail work off the shoulders of the Secretary.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows that the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, at least ever since I have been here, when there was an Assistant Secretary, spent a large part of his time traveling around the country delivering useless lectures—perhaps not useless, but delivering lectures.

Mr. LEVER. The present Assistant Secretary is on some commission to study farm conditions in Europe.

Mr. MANN. And out of the country, and has just now resigned because he does not want to come home, so the papers state, but as far as doing any practical work in the office of the Assistant Secretary is concerned, if he has ever done it, I never have happened to hear of it. Perhaps he has. Without any trouble at all, and so far as I know without any detriment to the Agricultural Department, he went abroad and engaged in other work. Now comes along a proposition to put in two assistant secretaries, done, so far as I can see, for the purpose of providing an additional job for some ex-Member of Congress, or some one else, shortly to be an ex-Member, probably.

Mr. LEVER. I submit that the man who is to be appointed Assistant Secretary of Agriculture is one of the great agricultural experts of this country and is now one of the assistant secretaries.

Mr. MANN. How many assistant secretaries have they now?

Mr. LEVER. Three.

Mr. MANN. Where did they get authority for three Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture?

Mr. LEVER. Under the food-stimulation act.

Mr. MANN. They just appoint them without authority?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, no; we provided for that in the food-production act. It is in existing law.

Mr. MANN. That expires with the war?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Who is that assistant? I do not happen to be familiar with the personnel there, for I have been away for a while, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. LEVER. The present assistant secretaries are Mr. Christie, of Indiana; Mr. Ousley, of Texas; and, up until yesterday, Mr. Vrooman, of Illinois.



Mr. MANN. I know nothing against any one of them; I know nothing about any one of them.

Mr. LEVER. I think they are all able men. I was very much impressed with Mr. Christie in his statement before the committee.

Mr. MANN. I suppose it is inevitable that we will increase these places, and I think it will be to the detriment of the service.

Mr. LEVER. I hope not, and I should not think so.

Mr. MANN. Wherever you have an assistant secretary, it is just one more step up the ladder along to the top. There is hardly a branch of the Government where that is not true. A matter has to go through the chief of a bureau, and then something has to be done by the assistant secretary, who knows nothing about it as a rule, and when he does know anything about it he is generally misinformed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I question whether we should adopt the policy of providing additional assistant secretaries for peace-time conditions. Everyone knows that the Navy Department has had tremendous burdens cast upon it by reason of the war, and yet the Navy Department has not come to Congress asking for additional assistant secretaries, even for the management of the Navy and its operations during war time. The Department of Commerce has had additional burdens thrown upon it, and it has only one assistant secretary. The Department of Labor has been very active during war times, and it has but one assistant secretary. There were additional burdens thrown upon the Department of Agriculture by reason of the food act and activities connected with the war that might have necessitated additional assistant secretaries, but I hope the gentleman will realize now that the war is over that we should get back to peace times. If we are going to grant two assistant secretaries to the Department of Agriculture we will have other departments coming before us, with just as good grounds, asking for additional secretaries.

Mr. LEVER. Let me suggest this to the gentleman: The Department of Agriculture is peculiar to itself; it studies practically everything from the growth of a vegetable to the life of the bison on the ranges out West. Its activities are numerous and its studies varied. There are more small items carried in this bill for \$500 or \$5,000 or \$50,000 for carrying on sundry and various activities than can be found in the appropriation bill of any other department of the Government. More than that, the Department of Agriculture is the scientific department of the Government, highly scientific, and you can not compare this department with the War Department or with the Post Office Department where you have assistant secretaries. In the Post Office Department I think there are four assistants.

The Secretary must have somebody, or should have somebody, to whom he is willing to trust some of these minor details, so that he may give his time to the study of larger problems in respect to the agriculture of the country. I feel that the committee was justified in this proposition. I think there is a good deal in what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has said, but I am trusting that in the future the policy will be different and that the Secretary himself will shift from his own shoulders some of these smaller burdens so that he can give more attention to the larger duties of his office. A practice has grown up here of recent years of placing upon Cabinet officers burdens which ought to be borne by a specially appointed commission. For instance, the commissioner of agriculture is on the nitrate board and various and sundry boards to locate reserve banks, to locate farm-loan banks throughout the country, and so forth, and it seems to me that we are piling a good deal on these men and that they ought to have some assistants in the smaller things of the offices.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can not bring myself to the belief that if the Navy Department only requires one Assistant Secretary, and the Department of Commerce, with its increased activities under the Bureau of Standards and all the other bureaus, only requires one Assistant Secretary, that we should provide in an appropriation bill an additional Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. Chairman, I also rise to inquire what is the reason for increasing the salary of the private secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture from \$2,500 to \$3,000?

Mr. LEVER. The committee of its own initiative, I desire to say, made this increase. The Secretary did not estimate for it nor request it. It was not suggested by the gentleman who is filling the place, but for several years now he has presented the estimates of the Department of Agriculture to the Committee on Agriculture, and I think every member of the committee, regardless of party affiliation, will concur in the statement I make, that there is no more efficient man in the public service than he. He has been of immense value to the committee in the prepa-

ration of its bills, and of the committee's own initiative we gave this increase.

Mr. STAFFORD. That argument, presumably, might be made for every one of the secretaries, because they are valuable to the department—

Mr. LEVER. But this is not that type of man; he knows all the details of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is aware we pay the private secretaries to the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Commerce \$2,500?

Mr. LEVER. Well, I do not think either one of those departments compares in importance with the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. STAFFORD. Naturally the chairman of the committee, who has done such great work during the years he has had charge of this bill, would think that the work of this department excels all others, but there must be some harmony of salaries.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman know what the private secretary of the Secretary of War gets?

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the private secretary of the Secretary of War gets \$3,000. The private secretaries of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce get \$2,500. If this man is such an exceptional man, perhaps it might be well to provide \$500 additional while the office is held by the same individual.

Mr. LEVER. I would be perfectly willing to do that.

Mr. MANN. Why not do that?

Mr. STAFFORD. If he is such an exceptional man. We have instances in the departmental service where there are exceptional men filling positions, and we sometimes recognize them by providing additional salaries while the office is held by that particular individual.

I would like also to inquire what the thought of the committee was in increasing the salary of the inspector from \$2,750 to \$3,000, and in providing additional attorneys, one at \$3,500 and two at \$3,250 each?

Mr. LEVER. We did not increase the salary of the inspector.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Over the bill carried last year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Page 2, line 14.

Mr. LEVER. Yes. This was very strenuously urged by the Secretary in a statement sent to me. This man is in charge of the office of inspection. He reviews all personnel matters, has supervision of the fiscal operations of the department, advises as to financial procedure, and prepares important financial reports for submission by the Secretary to Congress. He served 23 years in the department, receiving his last promotion July 1, 1912, so that he has not had a promotion in six years, and we thought in view of his long and efficient services that he ought to be promoted.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman recognizes in the legislative bill the heads of departments and bureaus are asking us to raise salaries, but we did not think this was the time to raise salaries on a wholesale scale.

Mr. LEVER. Well, I think Congress ought to adopt the policy of trying to compensate the men who are really efficient.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think Congress should have adopted a policy of having salaries equalized instead of allowing one grade of salary to pertain to the Agricultural Department and another grade pertain in the other departments.

Mr. LEVER. I hope the commission appointed by the joint law will work out the question of salaries, because it is a burden upon the appropriation committees, I am sure.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I inquire what is the purpose sought to be accomplished by the proviso in throwing the mantle of the civil service about certain departmental employees?

Mr. LEVER. The purpose there is to retain these attorneys in the classified service. We did not want to make it a political job, and this proviso does that. They retain the civil-service status in this connection.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is a change of designation from law clerk to attorney. The classification of attorney is not under the classified service, and in order to make this change of title and keep the position in the classified service the proviso to which the gentleman refers was inserted, but it is not a change of the situation at all.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Surely.

Mr. MANN. I can not see what the purpose is and what is the object in giving the title of "attorney." Is there any attorney in any other department of the Government? Is there an attorney in any other department of the Government?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Where?

Mr. LEVER. The Department of Justice—

Mr. MANN. Oh, well—

Mr. LEVER. And the Post Office Department.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is speaking about a law department. Is there an attorney anywhere else in any other department of the Government?

Mr. LEVER. I think I can show it to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Now, the fact is the Department of Agriculture has a solicitor not under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice. He is the only law officer of the Government in any department not under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice as such, but we have law clerks in the Treasury Department and law clerks in various other departments. I am not sure but there is a solicitor in the Department of Commerce not under the Department of Justice. Now, does the committee propose to inaugurate a policy of the giving of private attorneys in the various departments who have no relation whatever to the Attorney General or to the Attorney General's office? I think the word "attorney" ought to be supposed to come from the Attorney General's office.

Mr. LEVER. Let me say this, that the kind of men we have here designated "attorneys" have heretofore been under the designation of "law clerks," but they are not law clerks at all. They are all doing genuine attorneys' work.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt of that.

Mr. LEVER. They appear in court and conduct cases for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. And yet they go there in the capacity of law clerks.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. We felt that the change of name should be made.

Mr. MANN. They go there in the capacity of solicitors to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LEVER. And then the law designates them—

Mr. MANN. As law clerks.

Mr. LEVER. It may have been better to call them assistants.

Mr. MANN. The same is true of the Treasury Department and various other departments of the Government. The Treasury Department is filled with lawyers designated as law clerks passing upon the most important propositions which the Government has relating to the collection of internal revenue, and so forth. They are not designated as attorneys.

Mr. LEVER. Omitting the Department of Justice, I notice here the Federal Trade Commission has 11 attorneys, examiners, and special examiners; 19 attorneys, special attorneys, examiners, special agents; 5 attorneys, examiners; and so forth.

Mr. MANN. So has the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. LEVER. And the Department of the Interior has 3 attorneys, 1 assistant attorney, 2 assistant attorneys, and the Post Office Department has 1 assistant attorney, 3 assistant attorneys, 1 assistant attorney, and 1 law clerk. The Navy Department has none. The Judge Advocate General's office has none.

Mr. MANN. They have a lot of attorneys, too?

Mr. LEVER. I said none.

Mr. STAFFORD. They have law clerks.

Mr. MANN. They have a great many.

Mr. LEVER. They have law clerks.

Mr. MANN. They have colonels and majors and captains and lieutenants and maybe brigadier generals, for all I know. Are these others designated as attorneys?

Mr. LEVER. I am reading from the statements prepared by the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MANN. Of course.

Mr. LEVER. And I do not think he would misrepresent the subject.

Mr. MANN. I do not think he intended to misrepresent it. These people are actually attorneys.

Mr. LEVER. The Department of the Interior has three attorneys, a board of appraisers, each \$4,000; one assistant attorney, \$3,000; two assistant attorneys, \$2,750 each.

Mr. MANN. There is a board of appraisers in the Department of the Interior? Is that it?

Mr. LEVER. I presume so.

Mr. MANN. How are they designated? As a board of appraisers or attorneys?

Mr. LEVER. Attorneys on the board of appraisers.

Mr. MANN. I think they are attorneys but I doubt if they are so designated.

Mr. LEVER. So there are attorneys established throughout all these departments.

Mr. MANN. There are attorneys in every branch of the Government service doing legal work, law clerks usually, or else men employed in the office of the solicitors of the various departments, the solicitors being under the Attorney General.

Mr. LEVER. I would not object at all to assistant solicitors if it would satisfy the gentleman's desire in the matter.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then your salaries are out of range with salaries being paid to assistant solicitors in the departments. For instance, the Assistant Solicitor in the Department of Commerce receives \$3,000. Now, you propose to increase the salary of a law clerk from \$3,250 to \$3,500, and call him an attorney. It is not the practice, as has been pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], to describe these employees as attorneys, except in the Department of Justice.

Mr. LEVER. I assure the gentleman that statement is inaccurate.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that under the classification of employees under the solicitors of the respective departments they are known as law clerks.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to make a point of order on the positions of two Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture, at \$5,000 each.

Mr. LEVER. I do not concede that that is subject to a point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will argue that.

Mr. LEVER. The Department of Agriculture has full authority to employ persons to carry on its business. That matter has been settled time and time again and ruled upon by the present occupant of the chair. The other is subject to a point of order. I ask for a ruling on that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman mean to claim that he has authority to bring in on an appropriation bill authorizations for officials that are not provided by law, just because we have created a Department of Agriculture, and that he would have authority to provide for 10 Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture without an authorization of law? He certainly does not mean to contend that?

Mr. LEVER. It is simply increasing the number; that is all.

Mr. STAFFORD. If that is the case, then you could provide for more than one Secretary of Agriculture; instead of providing for one, you could provide for two.

Mr. LEVER. The number of assistant secretaries is not fixed by law. The Secretary is fixed by law.

Mr. STAFFORD. The number is fixed by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina where he finds the authority to which he refers?

Mr. LEVER. In section 522 of the Revised Statutes, where it says:

The Commissioner of Agriculture shall appoint a chief clerk with a salary of \$2,200.

And so on. And then it goes on:

And he shall, as Congress may from time to time provide, employ other persons for such time as their services may be needed, including chemists, botanists, and entomologists, and other persons skilled in the natural science pertaining to agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Has the Congress otherwise provided for giving him permission to appoint any number of assistants?

Mr. LEVER. I know of no such authority, no such specific act. I presume that this place has been filled under this general authority here.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that in the appropriation bill we could increase the number of employees in the Department of Agriculture. In all of the organic acts creating all the various departments provisions are made for the employment of clerks and various other persons in the departments as Congress may from time to time provide, different language being used in different organic acts; but the substance and purport are the same, and under this organic act we have the authority in the appropriation bill to increase the number of clerks, to increase the number of chemists, to increase the number of scientific men working in the Department of Agriculture, and have so authorized in the organic act; and in the same way we have authority in the Post Office appropriation bill to increase the number of clerks, to increase the number of carriers, to increase the number of the personnel of the department. But there are limitations to that, it seems to me. These organic acts refer not to the superior officer at the head of the department but to the personnel of the department. In the language of the organic act creating the Commissioner of Agriculture the language relates to certain under employees or officials. It does not relate to the men who are supervising officials



at the top. And it seems to me that while it is in order to increase the number of employees of the department below, it is not in order to increase the number of officials at the top, which are not covered by the language of the organic act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has no personal recollection of having passed on this or a similar proposition at any previous time.

Mr. LEVER. Not on this proposition, I will say to the Chair, but on the general proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The organic act undoubtedly gives the Secretary of Agriculture authority to increase any given number of employees in the different places provided for by law, but that does not apply to administrative positions such as an assistant secretary to the department. For instance, the Chair thinks that the position of First Assistant Secretary is one position, and that of Second Assistant Secretary is a different position, and the Third Assistant Secretary is still a different position, and so on. The Chair does not think that the organic act gave the Secretary of Agriculture authority to increase the number of assistant secretaries, and you can not appropriate for such a position against a point of order unless Congress had authorized or created the particular position. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have other points of order to make, but I have no objection to having the gentleman's amendment pending, and having it read for information.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEVER: Page 2, line 4, after the semicolon, insert "Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, \$5,000."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on "one inspector, \$3,000"; "one attorney, \$3,500"; two attorneys, at \$3,250 each"; and the proviso—

Mr. LEVER. I concede those points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LEVER. Would the gentleman from Wisconsin be willing to except from his points of order the "private secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture" if I shall use this further language, "and \$500 additional as long as the present incumbent holds the position"?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am perfectly willing, in view of the statement of the committee that this is an exceptional man.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report another amendment which the gentleman from South Carolina has sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEVER: Page 2, line 8, after the figures "\$2,000," insert "and \$500 additional as long as the present incumbent holds the position."

Mr. STAFFORD. It should be "\$2,500," with "\$500 additional."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be modified as indicated.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

On lines 13 and 14, "one inspector, \$3,000; one inspector, \$2,750."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEVER: Page 2, lines 13 and 14, after "\$2,000," where it occurs the second time, insert "one inspector, \$2,750."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from South Carolina another amendment to offer?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Wisconsin or the committee will permit, I ask that we pass over this attorney matter, because we will have to rewrite most of this language.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to pass over the matter indicated.

Mr. MANN. Why not put in the language in the present law by increasing the present law clerk?

Mr. LEVER. I prefer to come back later. The clerk will prepare it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to pass over the matter in lines 14 and 15, page 2, for the present. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Office of Farm Management: For the employment of persons in the city of Washington and elsewhere, furniture, supplies, travelling expenses, rent outside of the District of Columbia, and all other expenses necessary in carrying out the work herein authorized, as follows:

To investigate and encourage the adoption of improved methods of farm management and farm practice, \$218,160: *Provided*, That of this amount \$23,873 may be used in ascertaining the cost of production of the principal staple agricultural products.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have no doubt that the members of the committee will have a rational explanation, but this item strikes my funny bone. Here is a direction that the cost of production of the principal agricultural products shall be obtained at an expense of \$23,873. From the beginning of time so far as history records people have endeavored to learn the cost of production especially of agricultural products. Along comes the Agricultural Department and proposes to ascertain the cost of production of all the principal agricultural products and to charge only \$23,873 for it. They know just what it is going to cost, down to the odd three dollars. Now, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] knows that the Agricultural Department can not obtain information which begins to tell the cost of production of the agricultural products for any such sum of money, and I beg to inquire what the real purpose of this item is.

Mr. LEVER. I will tell the gentleman what the real purpose is. Speaking for myself now, and not for the committee, I think the proposition to obtain the cost of the production of farm products is almost an impossible proposition. I feel that I ought to say that much. But there has been a tremendous demand through certain farm organizations that some effort be made at least to approximate the cost of certain staple agricultural products. When Assistant Secretary Christie was before the committee, the committee ascertained that the department had been expending this sum of money, \$23,873, in that line of work during the past fiscal year.

Mr. MANN. Without authority of law?

Mr. LEVER. Under this same item.

Mr. MANN. If they have expended it in the past with due authority, why do you now give the authority here?

Mr. LEVER. It was at the suggestion of certain members of the committee. On account of this large demand for this kind of work, made by these organizations, we ought to set it out in the bill and make it specific and certain that they are going to do this work. As far as I am concerned, I am inclined to think that they have a big job on their hands.

Mr. MANN. We made an appropriation for the current fiscal year of \$221,660, to investigate and encourage the adoption of improved methods of farm management and farm practice. It would take a man with a very wild dream to suppose that the ascertainment of the cost of production of the principal staple agricultural products is authorized by an appropriation—

to investigate and encourage the adoption of improved methods of farm management and farm practice.

And if the department has diverted the sum of \$23,873 from the investigation and encouragement of improved methods of farm management and farm practice, in order to chase will-o-the-wisps, now it is proposed to encourage them to do it. The sum appropriated for the study of farm management and improved methods of farm practice was not very great, but apparently greater than they could expend for that purpose, so they diverted it to something that is a pure chimera. While I have no objection to studying the cost of production of agricultural products and getting information which is of value, the language of the bill is that it can only be used in ascertaining the cost of production, and under the strict language of the law they could not use any of it unless they did ascertain the cost of production.

Mr. LEVER. I think the gentleman is correct in that.

Mr. MANN. It is not for the study of the cost of production. It is "to ascertain" the cost of production, an impossible feat. They are not desired to obtain for public use information about the cost of production, but they are to ascertain the cost of production, which will not be ascertained long after we are dead and buried.

Mr. HAUGEN. I may state to the gentleman that this work has been carried on for a number of years by the department, and at the suggestion of the representatives of the farm organizations this paragraph was put in the bill. The act provides for the adoption of improved methods of farm management and farm practice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. I ask to be recognized for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. The department has held that in order to advise the farmer what to plant it is necessary to ascertain the cost, to enable them to advise him whether to plant a particular cereal as, for instance, whether to plant oats or corn, and so on. That is the construction placed upon the language.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt the gentleman is correct, and I have no objection to studying the cost of production, as people desire to have it studied, though plainly the original language did not authorize the expenditure of the money for that purpose.

Mr. HAUGEN. I am, of course, aware of the fact that other commissions are doing that work and that this is an overlapping or a duplication of activity, but this is only one of the many duplications in the departments. You can hardly touch one item in this bill without finding duplication of activities of other bureaus and departments.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 2.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to recur to page 2, line 14. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEVER: Page 2, line 14, after the figures "\$2,250," strike out "one attorney, \$3,500," and insert in lieu thereof the words "one law clerk, \$3,250."

Mr. LEVER. That is the exact language of the law now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEVER. I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEVER: Page 2, line 15, strike out "two attorneys, at \$3,250 each" and insert in lieu thereof the words "two law clerks, at \$3,000 each."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman that if he is going to provide four law clerks, at \$3,000 each, he do it by providing for four law clerks, at \$3,000 each, instead of putting in one item "two law clerks, at \$3,000 each," followed by another item "two law clerks, at \$3,000 each," as the bill would read if the gentleman's amendment were adopted. I suggest that he amend, in line 24, by striking out "two" and inserting "four," so that it will read "four law clerks, at \$3,000 each."

Mr. LEVER. That ought to be two law clerks, at \$3,000 each.

Mr. MANN. In line 34 there is an item now in the bill, an increase of two law clerks, at \$3,000 each.

Mr. HAUGEN. May I suggest that I believe it should read three law clerks, at \$3,000 each, if you intend to make the number that is carried at the present time and as suggested by the solicitor.

Mr. LEVER. The present law carries two, at \$3,000.

Mr. MANN. The amendment is precisely the same language as in line 24, only the gentleman proposes to insert it in line 15. If it is the intention of the gentleman to have it appear twice—

Mr. LEVER. It should be three law clerks, at \$3,000 each.

Mr. MANN. I am willing to make it three law clerks. The present bill provides for two extra law clerks, and if the gentleman wants to provide for two extra law clerks he should change the "two" to "four."

Mr. LEVER. I understood the gentleman from Wisconsin objected to the title and number.

Mr. MANN. He made a point of order on the title; he could not make a point of order on the number.

Mr. HAUGEN. I think the gentleman would not object to making it three law clerks.

Mr. LEVER. I think we had better leave it as it is in the present law. The purpose of having two new clerks or attorneys was for the purpose of getting two additional men into the service and, in a way, opening up promotions for those below.

Mr. MANN. Then the gentleman does not want to offer his amendment at all.

Mr. LEVER. I think that is true. The last amendment is not necessary, and, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the disease of tuberculosis of animals, for its control and eradication, for the tuberculin testing of animals, and for researches concerning the cause of the disease, its modes of spread, and methods of treatment and prevention, including demonstrations, the formation of organizations, and such other means as may be necessary, either independently or in cooperation with farmers, associations, State or county authorities, \$993,520: *Provided, however,* That in carrying out the purpose of this appropriation, if in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture it shall be necessary to destroy tuberculous animals and to compensate owners for loss thereof, he may, in his discretion, expend in the city of Washington or elsewhere out of the moneys of this appropriation such sums as he shall determine to be necessary for the reimbursement of owners of animals so destroyed, in cooperation with such States, counties, or municipalities as shall by law or by suitable action in keeping with its authority in the matter and by rules and regulations adopted and enforced in pursuance thereof, provide inspection of tuberculous animals and for compensation to owners of animals so destroyed, but no part of the money hereby appropriated shall be used in compensating owners of such animals except in cooperation with and supplementary to payments to be made by State, county, or municipality where destruction of such animals shall take place; nor shall any payment be made hereunder as compensation for or on account of any such animal destroyed if at the time of inspection or test of such animal or at the time of condemnation thereof it shall belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or corporation to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered for the purpose of being slaughtered: *Provided further,* That out of the money hereby appropriated no payment as compensation for any tuberculous animal destroyed shall exceed one-third of the difference between the appraised value of such animal and the value of the salvage thereof; that no payment hereunder shall exceed the amount paid or to be paid by the State, county, or municipality where the animal shall be condemned; and that in no case shall any payment hereunder be more than \$25 for any grade animal or more than \$50 for any pure-bred animal, and no payment shall be made unless the owner has complied with all lawful quarantine regulations: *And provided further,* That the act approved May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. L., 31), be, and the same is hereby, amended to permit cattle which have reacted to the tuberculin test to be shipped, transported, or moved from one State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, to any other State, Territory, or the District of Columbia for immediate slaughter in accordance with such rules and regulations as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture: *And provided further,* That the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, permit cattle which have been shipped for breeding or feeding purposes from one State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, to another State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, and which have reacted to the tuberculin test subsequent to such shipment, to be reshipped in interstate commerce to the original owner.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer several amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 20, after the word "State," insert the word "Territory."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 3, after the word "States," insert the word "Territories."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 11, after the word "State," insert the word "Territory."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 25, after the word "State," insert the word "Territory."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of making a few remarks on the general subject of eradication and control of tuberculosis in live stock. The first appropriation for this purpose was placed in the Agricultural appropriation bill a year ago, and as finally amended it provided for \$500,000 to be used in cooperation with various States in combating through control and eradication processes this one of the oldest diseases not only in the human family but of the brute creation. It is practically doubled this year in response to a zealous interest and cooperation manifested by nearly every State in the Union.

It is not necessary for me to suggest, as we are now nearing the close of the greatest war in history, the importance of the food problem. The largest source of loss in food animals existing in this country for the last 15 years and throughout Europe for centuries is the ravage of tuberculosis. It is a fact that tuberculosis is less destructive in America, however destructive it may be here, than it is in any of the leading live-stock nations of Europe. While our losses have been large, Germany's has been much larger as expressed in percentage. In some States of Europe, such as Denmark, tuberculosis has not only attacked cattle, where we usually expect to find it, but nearly 50 per cent of the horses of that country are afflicted with tuberculosis, communicated, it is thought, largely through the horses drinking milk from tubercular cows.

That is suggestive of what might be a large source of loss to the human family, and might be discussed with some propriety, but as far as this bill is concerned the discussion is purely economic.

In some extended remarks a year ago on this matter I pointed out what I thought would be the condition in Europe at the close of the war. I predicted that out of the ravages of war, the lack of opportunity to build up the herds, the ruin and destruction that would occur from disease, and the over-



riding by the conquering armies there would be a very large decrease of herds, and the result of it would be a great demand for American cattle and hogs and, to a limited extent, sheep, because sheep is the only food animal practically immune from this scourge.

Statistics are being given out now as to the condition of live stock in Europe. Britain, isolated as she was from the tread of armies and drawing from America largely for her beef, has been wise enough to keep up her herds. But no country of continental Europe has been able to do that. France has lost in flocks and herds from 15 to 25 per cent. It is thought that Germany, on account of her blockade and the demand not only for her own armies and people but for the armies of those cooperating with her, lost more largely of her herds than did France. Italy's flocks and herds were largely depleted. Holland, Denmark, Spain, and Switzerland were drained, while Russia, Turkey, and the Balkans lost more than a third of their food animals. Each of these to feed their people and retain the fertility of their soil desire to replenish their flocks and herds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. SLOAN. The result is, Mr. Chairman, that there will be a tremendous demand for the live stock of America. They will be careful to obtain practically disease-free live stock for breeding purposes. For that reason if America would maintain her own herds and not allow them to be depleted through disease or too much shipping it is important that the eradication movement go on under the impetus of this appropriation to the highest possible extent.

The following is one of the effective methods of discouraging tuberculous herds and encouraging those free from it, known as accredited herd method:

#### UNIFORM METHODS AND RULES FOR TUBERCULOSIS-FREE ACCREDITED HERDS OF PURE-BRED CATTLE.

(Unanimously adopted by the United States Live Stock Sanitary Association and by representatives of pure-bred cattle breeders' associations and approved Dec. 23, 1917, by the United States Bureau of Animal Industry.)

1. A tuberculosis-free accredited pure-bred herd is one which has been tuberculin tested by the subcutaneous method, or any other test approved by the Bureau of Animal Industry, under the supervision of the Bureau of Animal Industry or a regularly employed veterinary inspector of the State in which cooperative tuberculosis-eradication work is conducted jointly by the United States Department of Agriculture and the State. Further, it shall be a herd in which no animal affected with tuberculosis has been found upon two annual or three semiannual tuberculin tests, as above described, and by physical examination.

2. The entire herd, or any cattle in the herd, shall be tuberculin tested or retested at such time as is considered necessary by the Federal and State authorities.

3. No cattle shall be presented for the tuberculin test which have been injected with tuberculin within 60 days immediately preceding or which have at any time reacted to a tuberculin test.

4. No herd shall be classed as an accredited herd in which tuberculosis has been found by the application of the test, as referred to in paragraph 1, until such herd has been successfully subjected to two consecutive tests with tuberculin, applied at intervals of not less than six months, the first interval dating from the time of removal of the tuberculous animal from the herd.

5. Prior to each tuberculin test satisfactory evidence of the identity of the registered animals shall be presented to the inspector. Any grade cattle maintained in the herd or associated with animals of the herd shall be identified by a tag or other marking satisfactory to the State and Federal officials.

6. All removals of registered cattle from the herd, either by sale, death, or slaughter, shall be reported promptly to the said State or Federal officials, giving the identification of the animal and, if sold, the name and address of the person to whom transferred. If the transfer is made from the accredited herd to another accredited herd, the shipment shall be made only in properly cleaned and disinfected cars. No cattle shall be allowed to associate with the herd which have not passed a tuberculin test approved by the State and Federal officials.

7. All milk and other dairy products fed to calves shall be that produced by an accredited herd, or, if from outside or unknown sources, it shall be pasteurized by heating to not less than 150° F. for not less than 20 minutes.

8. All reasonable sanitary measures and other recommendations by the State and Federal authorities for the control of tuberculosis shall be complied with.

9. Cattle from an accredited herd may be shipped interstate, by certificate obtained from the office of the State live stock sanitary officials of the State in which the herd is located or from the office of the Bureau of Animal Industry, without further tuberculin test for a period of one year, subject to the rules and regulations of the State of destination.

10. Strict compliance with these methods and rules shall entitle the owners of tuberculosis-free herds to a certificate, "Tuberculosis-Free

Accredited Herd," to be issued by the Bureau of Animal Industry and the State live stock sanitary authority. Said certificate shall be good for one year from date of test unless revoked at an earlier date.

11. Failure on the part of owners to comply with the letter or spirit of these methods and rules shall be considered sufficient cause for immediate cancellation of cooperation with them by the State and Federal officials.

The other day I heard on the floor of the House a very interesting speech from a gentleman whom we have often heard, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], in which he stated that a new policy with reference to the great staple products of his section of the country would be adopted. He suggested that there be a diminished planting of the great cotton staple, and also that there should be an increasing production of food, especially of beef and pork, in the southern part of this country. That is one of the wisest suggestions ever made by a gentleman who is a member of the Agricultural Committee on the floor of this House in behalf of what has been too long a one-crop section. There will be, of course, a large movement from the herds of the North to the herds of the South on the part of those who would build up that great industry. That industry has greater possibilities in the southern part of the United States than we have in the North.

Year after year the rigor of our winters demands that we burn up a large portion of our corn fed to our cattle, not for the purpose of adding flesh or food to the brute but to keep him warm. That is eliminated in the South. When the great pastures of the South, with their extended summer and limited winter, where the brutes can be comfortable throughout the whole year and at the same time enjoy pure air and water, are taken into consideration one can easily grasp the possibilities for the southern farmer. There is a great opportunity there to keep herds free from tuberculosis, and therefore from a source of great damage and loss.

Tuberculosis affects cattle not more than hogs. Later we will discuss another item in respect to hog cholera and its eradication. It is true that more hogs throughout the country suffer from tuberculosis than do from hog cholera. We do not usually think of it that way, because tuberculosis is an insidious disease and is not marked by sudden death, as is the case with cholera. It shows itself in a reduced condition and finally death. The discovery of the existence of the disease is usually made only after slaughter. The loss, of course, in hogs is not so great in tuberculosis as in cholera, because tuberculosis, unless in the extreme cases, does not entirely destroy the carcass. There is a great deal of salvage at all of the great slaughterhouses from hogs and cattle where tuberculosis affected the animal.

Commissioner Smith presented among other things the following statement as to losses and prevalence of disease in the United States:

#### LOSSES CAUSED BY THIS DISEASE.

According to the records of the meat inspection division of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry, there were 25,975 beef carcasses and 44,492 pork carcasses condemned as inedible for tuberculosis alone at the seven leading Middle West markets—Chicago, Kansas City, Omaha, East St. Louis, St. Paul, Sioux City, and St. Joseph—during the fiscal year 1916. This is the equivalent of 50 trainloads of cattle and hogs of 40 cars each that were consigned to the rendering tanks at these markets during one year because of having tuberculosis in so generalized a condition as to make the entire carcasses fit only for grease and fertilizer. There were a still greater number of carcasses passed for sterilization and sold as second-class canned beef and pork, upon which the loss was approximately 50 per cent.

Station.	Slaughter.	Retained for tuberculosis.	Per cent of total kill retained.	Sterilized for tuberculosis.	Per cent of total kill sterilized.	Condemned for tuberculosis.	Per cent of total kill condemned.
<b>CATTLE.</b>							
Omaha.....	707,365	14,157	2.00	832	0.12	2,207	0.31
South St. Joseph.....	249,858	2,285	.91	74	.03	661	.26
Kansas City.....	934,111	7,415	.79	421	.05	1,876	.20
National Stock Yards.....	540,429	3,202	.59	301	.06	996	.18
Sioux City.....	217,022	8,676	3.99	333	.15	1,198	.55
Chicago.....	1,934,862	87,102	4.50	4,742	.25	16,496	.85
St. Paul.....	228,172	10,820	4.67	86	.03	2,440	1.05
<b>SWINE.</b>							
Omaha.....	2,176,215	176,312	8.10	8,006	.37	4,733	.22
South St. Joseph.....	1,808,207	66,742	3.69	967	.05	3,269	.18
Kansas City.....	2,730,977	89,841	3.29	3,224	.12	4,042	.15
National Stock Yards.....	1,532,196	119,201	7.68	2,983	.20	2,901	.19
Sioux City.....	1,185,249	177,965	15.27	7,691	.66	3,515	.30
Chicago.....	7,343,748	1,161,339	15.81	36,273	.50	24,526	.33
St. Paul.....	1,608,074	81,254	5.4	1,453	.09	3,056	.20

The above table from the Bureau of Animal Industry shows that the disease is more prevalent at the northern markets. A total of 40,000,000 hogs were slaughtered during the year 1916 at all packing plants in the United States where Federal inspection is maintained. Approximately 10 per cent of these were found on post-mortem examination to be affected with tuberculosis.

#### PREVALENCE OF THE DISEASE IN THE UNITED STATES.

Tuberculosis is found among cattle and hogs from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast. It is not as prevalent in the Southern States as in the Northern States. Cattle are much less numerous in the South, are not so closely confined, making the conditions less favorable for the spreading of the infection, and because of the prevalence of the cattle "tick" causing Texas fever fewer well-bred imported cattle have gone into the South up to this time. The following table shows the number of cattle and hogs slaughtered at the seven leading Middle West markets during the fiscal year 1916, and the number retained for tuberculosis (affected with the disease), and the number sterilized and condemned for tuberculosis.

Dairy cattle are more tuberculous than beef cattle, and the percentage of infected cattle is usually higher in the States where more dairy cattle are owned. The disease is found to be quite prevalent in beef cattle even in the so-called range States.

The reason why this disease has not made the inroads in America is because we have such broad areas, such wide expanse of country, that it naturally prevents tuberculosis becoming intensified, as in Germany, France, Holland, and Denmark, but that time is going by. Tuberculosis has not only become prevalent throughout the States through the Middle East and Middle West, but there are few range sections throughout the West that are not now more or less affected with tuberculosis. The reason why it has not been kept back more than it has is because there has been no concerted action. Action to be effective and be successful must be when the Government itself co-operates with the various States, and if the States do not act as units, then with the counties and municipalities, in order to control and eradicate, or at least reduce to the irreducible minimum, this scourge. That can be done, I think, in the course of

10 or 12 years. I suggested a year ago that to spread twelve to fifteen million dollars over that period of time, which would cover three or four generations of cattle and more than twice that many of hogs, tuberculosis in the United States could be practically eradicated. I still hold that view, and I am pleased that the committee has taken a broad vision and has doubled last year's appropriation for that purpose.

As evidence of what the country is willing to do, there will probably be more than \$2 collectively appropriated by the various States of the Union for every dollar appropriated by the Government of the United States.

#### Annual appropriations available for tuberculosis work in 10 States.

Connecticut	\$25,000
Maine	40,000
Massachusetts	43,000
Minnesota	40,000
New York	150,000
Pennsylvania	100,000
Vermont	65,000
Ohio	100,000
Wisconsin	25,000
Kentucky	15,000

Total..... 603,000

Michigan paid out last year \$62,815 and Missouri \$29,000 for this work.

Under this bill the Government is expected to stand one-third of the slaughter loss, the State one-third, and the owner one-third. I think, under all the circumstances, that a million dollars is a fair and generous sum.

Iowa, Nebraska, and many other States are appropriating large sums for this work, and nearly all the States are expected to cooperate during this coming year.

The following summary issued by the Bureau of Animal Industry for December, 1918, suggests the interest of 39 States.

#### Summary of tuberculosis eradication work in cooperation with the various States, month of December, 1918.

Station.	States.	Tuberculin tests.					Employees.		Inspector in charge.
		Number of lots.	Number of cattle tested.	Number reacted.	Number slaughtered.	Increase in number tested over previous month.	Bureau.	State.	
Albany, N. Y.	New York	9	517	12	4	119	1	1	Dr. H. B. Leonard.
Atlanta, Ga.	Georgia	18	614	17	16		3	1	Dr. W. M. MacKellar.
Birmingham, Ala.	Alabama	42	1,165	24	20		7	1	Dr. R. E. Jackson.
Bismarck, N. Dak.	North Dakota	58	1,378	57		742	2	18	Dr. H. H. Cohenour.
Boston, Mass.	Massachusetts	10	137	3	1		3		Dr. E. A. Crossman.
Do.	Maine	32	602	7	9	262	2	2	Do.
Do.	Rhode Island	2	43	5	3	41	1		Do.
Do.	Connecticut	11	314	8	25	127	1		Do.
Do.	New Hampshire	1	42				1		Do.
Chicago, Ill.	Illinois	41	603	70	90		7	1	Dr. J. J. Lintner.
Clarksburg, W. Va.	West Virginia	7	167	8		167	1	1	Dr. W. R. Van Ness.
Columbia, S. C.	South Carolina	10	252	5	5		3	1	Dr. W. K. Lewis.
Denver, Colo.	Colorado	4	71	2		61	1		Dr. W. E. Howe.
Do.	Wyoming	21	93				1	1	Do.
Des Moines, Iowa	Iowa	8	254	11			3	2	Dr. F. H. Thompson.
Harrisburg, Pa.	Pennsylvania	40	522	22	15		4	1	Dr. P. E. Quinn.
Indianapolis, Ind.	Indiana	20	440	28	15		9	5	Dr. J. E. Gibson.
Do.	Ohio	33	604	54	37	228	5	5	Do.
Do.	Wisconsin	8	252	16	16		2	5	Do.
Do.	Kentucky	17	359	24	6		4	4	Do.
Jackson, Miss.	Mississippi	134	951	10	24	245	4		Dr. J. A. Barger.
Kansas City, Kans.	Kansas	17	264	13	60		3		Dr. T. J. Eagle.
Lansing, Mich.	Michigan	28	747	37		141	5	1	Dr. T. S. Rich.
Montpelier, Vt.	Vermont	53	1,529	197	239		6	3	Dr. A. J. De Fosset.
Nashville, Tenn.	Tennessee	41	839	13	6		4	1	Dr. W. B. Lincoln.
New Orleans, La.	Louisiana	30	506	46	62		2		Dr. R. W. Tuck.
Omaha, Nebr.	Nebraska	16	422	18	10	317	4	1	Dr. H. Busman.
Pierre, S. Dak.	South Dakota	9	436	48	28		1	1	Dr. J. O. Wilson.
Portland, Oreg.	Oregon	13	186	2	3		4	1	Dr. S. B. Foster.
Do.	Washington	20	504	28	3		1	3	Do.
Richmond, Va.	Virginia	61	1,346	41	42	53	7		Dr. R. E. Brookbank.
Do.	North Carolina	17	388	3	4	39	2		Do.
St. Paul, Minn.	Minnesota	46	1,772	64		608	10	4	Dr. W. J. Fretz.
Do.	do.	66	1,414	195	165	371			Do.
Salt Lake City, Utah	Utah	11	103	6	11		5	2	Dr. F. E. Murray.
Do.	Idaho	1	12						Do.
Tallahassee, Fla.	Florida	29	709	7		508	5	2	Dr. J. G. Fish.
Trenton, N. J.	New Jersey	8	102	11	2		1		Dr. W. G. Middleton.
Do.	Delaware				1				Do.
Washington, D. C.	District Columbia	12	17				2		Dr. J. A. Kiernan.
Do.	Maryland	36	682	21	8	281	5		Do.
Do.	Miscellaneous	12	193	9	9	166	1		Do.
Total		1,052	21,651	1,142	2,068		133	68	

NOTE.—The first line of Minnesota is accredited herds; the second, area work.

This is not a matter of investigation. We know how to accomplish the eradication of tuberculosis. It prevailed in the District of Columbia 12 or 15 years ago, so that 18 to 20 per cent of the bovines of this District were afflicted with tuberculosis, while now less than 1 per cent are so afflicted. I am convinced that what has been done in the District of Columbia can be accom-

plished through the work of the Government of the United States and the various States in cooperation. We are all now especially aroused to the production of beef, pork, and mutton, and that is evidenced by the very great demand we had during the great world war. To conserve and increase our meat supply is important to producer and consumer as well. [Applause.]



Under leave of extension granted, I herewith append an interesting and illuminating statement by Dr. J. A. Kiernan, chief of the tuberculosis-eradication division:

#### COOPERATIVE TUBERCULOSIS ERADICATION WORK IN THE UNITED STATES.

The eradication of tuberculosis from our live stock is one of the greatest pieces of constructive live-stock sanitation work that has ever been undertaken in any land. This work has passed the experimental stage. The Bureau of Animal Industry has demonstrated for more than 10 years that when live-stock owners were interested in exterminating the disease and would follow the instructions laid down by the department tuberculosis could be eradicated from any herd, even though it was 75 per cent diseased.

More than 10 years ago the Bureau of Animal Industry undertook to eradicate tuberculosis from the cattle within the District of Columbia and near-by points in the State of Maryland and Virginia. At that time within the District there were approximately 1,200 cattle, and upon the application of the tuberculin test 18.87 per cent of the animals were found affected with tuberculosis. Each year since that time all of the herds within the District have been subjected to the test, and during 1918 it was revealed that less than 1 per cent of the animals were affected. This small amount of infection that persists from year to year is due largely to the introduction of cattle from other States. These new additions to the herds, although they are subjected to the tuberculin test, at times prove to be diseased upon the application of a retest. If no additions were made to the native herds of the District for a period of five years, it is confidently believed that tuberculosis would be absolutely exterminated. Similar progress has been made in the herds under the supervision in Maryland and Virginia and, in fact, wherever and whenever owners have placed their herds under supervision for the eradication of tuberculosis and have followed the prescribed rules they have succeeded in getting rid of the disease.

With the above-mentioned information at hand Congress appropriated \$500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, but this money did not become available until October 1, 1918, when the annual agricultural appropriation bill was approved. This item appropriating funds for the eradication of tuberculosis authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to compensate owners for cattle that are destroyed on account of tuberculosis.

The tuberculosis-free accredited-herd plan is one project of the general plan of a campaign which has been inaugurated in eradicating tuberculosis from live stock in the United States. This plan was jointly adopted in December, 1917, by the live-stock sanitary officials of all the States in the Union and the United States Bureau of Animal Industry.

Progress in eradicating any widespread animal disease depends not only on suitable methods of control, but also in large measure on the desire of live-stock owners to cooperate. It is important that they understand clearly why the work is done, the methods of conducting it, and the benefits which the completed work will bring.

Eradication of tuberculosis from live stock means primarily the removal of a constant source of danger to the health of mankind and of its animals; also, it will reduce sharply the economic losses from animal disease.

To accredit a herd as free from tuberculosis means briefly to certify officially that the owner has complied with specified requirements. Best results may be expected only when every live-stock owner becomes familiar with the provisions of the accredited-herd plan.

The idea and advantages of accrediting herds of cattle found to be free from tuberculosis has gained wide publicity and popularity among cattle breeders during the first year's work. They appreciate the fact that a certificate of approval indorsed by the State in which the herd belongs and the further indorsement by the United States Department of Agriculture gives prospective purchasers confidence that the animals are free from the disease, and they are in consequence willing to pay a considerable advance in price for such animals.

During the first year's operations 296 herds, comprising 9,284 cattle, have been fully accredited as free from tuberculosis; and 1,462 herds, having 35,052 cattle, passed one successful test in preparation for certification; in addition, 4,622 herds, both pure bred and grade, totaling 98,002 animals, have been under supervision for the eradication of tuberculosis. Each month a large number of additional herds are taken under supervision.

List No. 1 of herds officially accredited as free from tuberculosis and of herds that have passed one successful test with a view to certification was issued in pamphlet form and 50,000 copies have been distributed to cattle owners throughout the country. It is proposed shortly to revise the list and publish list No. 2, which will contain the names of the owners of the additional herds that have been fully accredited as well as those that have passed one successful test.

Tuberculosis eradication work is being carried on in more than 40 States in cooperation with the State live-stock sanitary officials and the stock owners. Joint agreements between the State and the Bureau of Animal Industry governing the application of the tuberculin test and the handling of the herd of cattle are forwarded to each owner interested in having his herd freed of tuberculosis or in having it accepted as officially accredited. Applications for the joint agreement may be made to the proper State sanitary official or to the Bureau of Animal Industry, Washington, D. C.

It has been found by very careful experiments and practical work that tuberculosis can not be detected to any great extent among animals by a physical examination. Herds which seem apparently healthy may be extensively affected with tuberculosis. The most reliable method for definitely determining whether tuberculosis exists or not is the tuberculin test applied by a trained operator. Tuberculin, while it is the most accurate diagnostic agency known to science, is safe only in the hands of a trained and skillful operator who is acquainted with its limitations and with the symptoms it produces in the animals to which it is applied.

It is proposed to carry on the accredited herd plan until practically all pure-bred herds of cattle in the United States are under State and Federal supervision for the eradication of tuberculosis. Thus it will be possible for an owner in one State to purchase cattle in another State with the assurance that he will receive animals that may be introduced into his herd with perfect safety so far as tuberculosis is concerned. Under former conditions many such animals proved to be a menace in place of an asset.

In addition to the accredited herd plan, the eradication of tuberculosis from live stock will be carried on in circumscribed areas comprising one or more counties. The disease will be eliminated from cattle and swine in such areas and the campaign extended until it takes in entire States.

In order that the work may progress satisfactorily, it is necessary that live-stock owners cooperate to the fullest extent. The success of the movement for eradicating tuberculosis rests upon the live-stock owners

of the country to a greater degree than on any other force. Whenever they are ready and willing to "get behind" the work success is bound to follow.

The legislatures in 23 States convene during the present winter, and from present indications the amount of money that will be appropriated by them for the eradication of tuberculosis from live stock will be nearly \$2,000,000, much of which will be used for indemnifying owners for cattle that are destroyed on account of tuberculosis. The appropriations for indemnity are in most cases being made with the understanding that partial indemnity will be made by the Federal Government if States provide for partial indemnity themselves. In States where it is necessary to change the laws relating to tuberculosis eradication in order to cooperate with the Federal Government and receive some Federal assistance in the way of indemnity, the necessary changes will in all probability be made. From the great interest that is being shown by the State legislatures it is very evident that the importance of tuberculosis eradication is realized and the Federal cooperation appreciated.

The great importance of eradicating tuberculosis from our live stock can be appreciated when we know that the value of the cattle in the United States on January 1, 1919, was \$3,796,725,000 and the estimated value of swine on the same date was \$1,665,987,000.

#### PROGRESS, TUBERCULOSIS ERADICATION, DURING YEAR 1918.

The tuberculosis-free accredited-herd plan, which was inaugurated in December, 1917, and has been worked out in cooperation with the United States Bureau of Animal Industry, was slightly changed at the twenty-second annual meeting of the United States Live-Stock Sanitary Association, held in Chicago, Ill., December 2-4, 1918. It was agreed to strike out the word "pure bred" so as to admit to certification grade herds in addition to registered cattle.

The annual conference between representatives of the United States Live-Stock Sanitary Association and the pure-bred cattle breeders' associations resulted in the further indorsement of the tuberculosis eradication campaign and a recommendation that the work be extended as rapidly as possible.

Very satisfactory progress has been made during the first year of the work, and prospects for the future are exceedingly bright. During the year 296 herds, comprising 9,284 cattle, have been fully accredited as free from tuberculosis, and 1,462 herds, having 35,052 cattle, passed one successful test in preparation for certification. In addition, 4,622 herds, both pure bred and grade, totaling 98,002 animals, have been under supervision for the eradication of tuberculosis. Each month additional herds are added to the list. A revision of list No. 1 of accredited herds will be made in the near future, and when printed will be widely distributed, as was the original list, the supply of which is now exhausted.

#### Details by States.

State.	Pure-bred herds accredited.		Pure-bred herds once tested without reactors.		Pure-bred herds containing one or more reactors.		Grade herds under supervision.	
	Herds.	Cattle.	Herds.	Cattle.	Herds.	Cattle.	Herds.	Cattle.
Alabama			23	655	12	682	88	4,102
District of Columbia	1	134					300	1,206
Florida			24	644	4	194	2	14
Georgia			14	916	11	953	212	5,379
Illinois	2	163	19	445	21	801	3	44
Indiana	17	377	64	1,295	39	989		
Iowa			4	77	8	395		
Kansas			18	345	12	261	4	19
Kentucky			57	1,569	23	1,284	2	88
Louisiana	1	18	15	1,059				
Maryland	2	21	28	723	37	1,122	90	1,595
Michigan	13	260	61	1,561	54	2,250		
Minnesota	88	2,987	186	5,031	131	4,826	374	5,239
Mississippi			42	1,063				
Missouri					3	127		
Montana	11	262	19	548	21	1,076	824	14,873
Nebraska			1	2	13	458		
New York			7	160	10	366	2	97
North Carolina	1	37	63	997	22	832	144	2,104
North Dakota	59	1,654	167	2,731	53	2,032	341	3,243
Ohio	1	25	75	1,495	94	4,225	4	15
Pennsylvania			59	675	26	801	10	119
South Carolina			26	756	12	619	78	2,512
South Dakota			8	231	23	708	101	621
Tennessee	2	99	20	595				
Texas			2	71				
Utah	4	155	16	300				
Vermont	8	294	72	1,888	67	2,551	162	2,954
Virginia	54	2,062	155	4,186	75	3,358	659	14,660
West Virginia			10	226	2	62	7	77
Wisconsin	9	344	50	1,374	29	1,265	2	25
New Hampshire	11	147	97	1,551	75	2,465	299	2,478
Connecticut								
Rhode Island								
Delaware								
New Jersey			8	179	8	855	1	27
Washington	12	245	52	1,684	22	820	6	149
Total	296	9,284	1,462	35,052	907	36,368	3,715	61,634

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most important items in this bill and to my mind in the years to come will be regarded as one of the wisest pieces of work that this body has ever proposed. I would not feel justified in letting this occasion pass without saying that this item in this bill is due, not in whole but in large measure, to the far-sightedness, the energy, and the perseverance, of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN]. [Applause.] It has always been a happy thought to me that the Committee on Agriculture knows no party lines. This item was suggested by the gentleman from Nebraska. He



urged it with all of the force of his eloquence and logic and good horse sense, as we say south of this river, with the result that he convinced the committee and convinced the Congress. The work has progressed so nicely, it has proven itself to be so beneficial, and is meeting with such hearty response from thoughtful men everywhere that the committee of its own initiative at this session of Congress in preparing this bill increased the appropriation by \$500,000 over the estimates submitted by the Department of Agriculture, and that action had the very hearty concurrence of the Department of Agriculture.

I feel that when the gentleman from Nebraska leaves Congress he can go before his people and receive from them the commendation of "Well done, thou good and faithful servant." [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has one minute remaining.

Mr. LEVER. I yield that to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the people of our State were among the first to realize the danger of tuberculosis to our herds, and I am glad to say have made commendable progress toward its eradication. The States of North Dakota and Minnesota have made the greatest progress of any area in the United States. This has been accomplished by the application of the tuberculin test and the slaughter of reactors, for which State indemnity has been paid.

The testing of herds in Minnesota and North Dakota has been voluntary rather than compulsory, and the testing is now being confined largely to pure-bred herds. No indemnity is paid by the State unless the entire herd is tested annually and the owner complies with certain regulations specified by the live-stock sanitary boards. The fact that Minnesota and North Dakota have the largest number of tuberculosis-free accredited herds, and the further fact that these States have also required the pasteurization of skim milk and other creamery by-products before it is fed to hogs, undoubtedly explains in large measure the cause of the low percentage of condemnations for tuberculosis among both cattle and hogs at the St. Paul market, as compared with all other northern markets. The records of the Division of Meat Inspection of the Department of Agriculture show that 3.8 per cent of all the cattle slaughtered at the Chicago, Sioux City, and Milwaukee markets during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, were found on post-mortem to be affected with tuberculosis, whereas only 1.9 per cent of all the cattle slaughtered at the St. Paul market during 1918 were found on post-mortem to be affected with tuberculosis. These statistics also show that 17 per cent of all the hogs slaughtered under Federal inspection at the Chicago, Sioux City, and Milwaukee markets during the year 1918 were found on post-mortem to be affected with tuberculosis, whereas at the St. Paul market during the same year but 5 per cent of the hogs slaughtered were found on post-mortem to be affected with tuberculosis. The pamphlet issued by the Bureau of Animal Industry on July 1, 1918, entitled, "The Control and Eradication of Tuberculosis," asserts that North Dakota and Minnesota have by far the largest number of tuberculosis-free accredited herds of any States of the Union.

Mr. Chairman, it is very plain that this problem must be attacked upon a national scale in order to bring complete success. So long as other States are careless or neglect to protect their herds our State will be in danger. I ask leave to print in the RECORD a letter received from our North Dakota State veterinarian, Dr. W. F. Crewe.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DR. CREWE'S LETTER.

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,  
LIVE STOCK SANITARY BOARD,  
January 22, 1919.

Hon. GEORGE M. YOUNG,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. YOUNG: I have received your communication of the 18th instant relative to the eradication of bovine tuberculosis.

It would seem superfluous to quote statistics regarding the prevalence of this disease in this country, as no doubt same have been furnished your committee by the Federal department. Our experience contending with this disease in this State during the past seven years and our knowledge of the prevalence of the disease in other States leads us to believe that the eradication of bovine tuberculosis is a national problem.

Work on this disease is being and has been carried on in a more or less irregular manner in many of the States with little or no uniformity. In some States practically nothing has been done. The disease is becoming more extensive every year until it is a serious menace to the cattle and swine industries.

On account of the enormity of the cattle and swine industries in this country the control and eradication of this disease presents the greatest undertaking that has been placed before sanitary authorities. Scientific investigators, sanitary authorities, and stock owners practically agree on plans for this undertaking. The entrance of the Federal Government into this work in cooperation with the different States

means the establishment of uniformity of these methods. The cooperation of the Federal authorities will add a great stimulus to the efforts of the different States.

The suppression of this disease means the reduction of the annual loss incurred. Neglect to control and suppress this disease means increased loss.

A liberal appropriation by the Federal Government means increased appropriations by the States and a corresponding decrease in the loss by disease.

North Dakota is expending effort in the endeavor to eradicate tuberculosis from our pure-bred herds and keep them free from this disease. We find that many pure-bred animals shipped from other States are diseased in spite of being accompanied by health certificates. To illustrate: Of 6,890 pure-bred cattle tuberculin tested in this State within the year, 44 per cent were found tuberculous. Within the year, 598 pure-bred cattle imported into the State were retested and 65 were found to be tuberculous, or over 11 per cent. In conjunction with our own efforts we are anxious to see this disease eliminated from other States and be thereby given better protection.

I might state that the budget committee has recommended an increase of our appropriation for tuberculosis of \$30,000 to \$40,000.

Thanking you for your kind interest in this subject, I remain,

Very respectfully, yours,

W. F. CREWE.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that our colleague from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN], who has again spoken so convincingly in favor of this appropriation item for the eradication of tuberculosis in cattle is not to be with us in the Sixty-sixth Congress. He pioneered the movement looking to the eradication of tuberculosis in both cattle and hogs, and the campaign against hog cholera, and his face became so familiar in our Agricultural Committee room that one day our chairman forgot to ask him to leave when we were to have an executive session. Now that he has succeeded in boosting the appropriation items for the eradication of tuberculosis in both cattle and hogs I assume that he will retire from Congress feeling that the purposes for which he came down here have been accomplished. Perhaps that is not true and that he had other ambitions in respect to legislation. If so, the members of the Committee on Agriculture were never taken into his confidence and never permitted to forget the commanding importance of caring for the health of our cattle and hogs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota for three minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad indeed to concur in what the chairman of the committee has said with respect to my distinguished colleague from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] and his efforts to promote the work under this item. The item itself and its present proportions are due more to the industry and the careful preparation and study of the gentleman from Nebraska than to any other one man or thing, and I am very glad myself to testify to the fact; and I can do that with particular fitness, because the State which I have the honor to represent, in part, has more accredited herds, has more herds in process of becoming accredited, has more herds under agreement with owners, and more herds on the waiting list than any other State in the Union, although the State of Minnesota has by no means yet the largest number of pure-bred cattle. The work is of very great interest and of very great importance to the State of Minnesota, and that State, like I think every other State in the Union in which stock raising or dairying is of any importance, will do its part, and more than its part, in the work of eradicating this disease.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by incorporating in the RECORD a letter from a member of the live-stock sanitary board of the State of Minnesota touching the cooperative work done under the item in that State.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting certain material mentioned. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The letter is as follows:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,  
LIVE STOCK SANITARY BOARD,  
St. Paul, January 17, 1919.

Hon. SYDNEY ANDERSON,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In the absence of our secretary, Dr. C. E. Cotton, I am asked by our board, in session to-day, to report our response to your request of January 9 for information concerning tuberculosis-control work in Minnesota.

During the year ending July 31, 1916, we expended \$28,283.81 in reimbursing owners for cattle killed on account of tuberculosis and approximately \$9,000 for veterinary services, including traveling expenses.

During the year ending July 31, 1917, we expended in reimbursement of owners for cattle killed on account of tuberculosis \$39,621.35, and approximately \$9,250 for veterinary services and traveling expenses.

For the year ending July 31, 1918, for tuberculous cattle, \$40,094.82, and approximately \$8,500 for veterinary services and traveling expenses.

It should be understood that no charge is made to the owner for veterinary services in this or any other similar State work.

The opportunity for enlarging this work is limited only by available funds. The sentiment among Minnesota breeders is such that an almost unlimited work could be done upon urgent request from owners. To



illustrate this, I would call your attention to the fact that Minnesota has now about 88 pure-bred herds on the fully accredited list; 182 herds have passed the first completely negative test and 131 other herds have had one test and are approximately clean.

The State and Federal bureau together have now work under way with about 562 herds. We have a waiting list of about 400 herds that have not been touched. There is absolutely no important opposition whatever, and the only objections and criticisms coming from Minnesota are that we do not get to the herds sooner. As to the present condition of Minnesota herds, I would offer the following quotation from a recent statement by a Bureau of Animal Industry official:

"According to a report rendered by the bureau ending December 1, 1918, Minnesota leads all States in tuberculosis-control work, with North Dakota a close second. At the present time there are over 820 herds under Federal-State supervision. The splendid position Minnesota holds along this particular line is due to the hearty cooperation of the past personnel of the live stock sanitary board, which has recently selected Dr. C. E. Cotton as secretary and executive officer, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Dr. S. H. Ward."

This is certainly a fine showing for Minnesota, and the Minnesota State Live Stock Sanitary Board and the veterinary division of the State agricultural college and experiment station, which two institutions have been working in perfect harmony, take a great deal of pride in the showing.

I would also call your attention to the fact that Minnesota's pure-bred, clean herds are constantly threatened by importations from herds in other States that are not so clean as Minnesota herds; for example, in 1917-18 of 442 pure-bred herds tested, containing about 14,200 cattle, 340 animals, or 2.4 per cent reacted. This is a very low average for pure-bred cattle, but our average reactions for several years with Minnesota pure-bred cattle that have been previously known and tested, has ranged about 1 per cent. A seriously large proportion of these reactions in 1917-18 were of cattle recently brought into the State. Minnesota pure-bred cattle raised in Minnesota herds have continued very clean. The point is that we are getting too many reactions among imported cattle and this lowers our per cent showing for the State. In addition to this, it is endangering our clean Minnesota herds. At a certain sale in Sioux City 19 animals were purchased by Minnesota breeders subject to test. Of the 19 animals only 9 were shipped into Minnesota after the test, and of these 9, 5 subsequently reacted on Minnesota home test. During the year ending July 31, 1918, we had 207 tuberculin test reactions in cattle imported almost entirely from six States.

As a representative of Minnesota, we are sure you will take pride in knowing that Minnesota has now more Federal-State accredited herds, more herds in the process of becoming accredited (having passed one clean test), more herds under agreement with owners, and more herds on the waiting list than any other State in the Union, and Minnesota is not as yet the biggest pure-bred cattle State in the Union by any means.

We have under way in Minnesota, in cooperation with the Federal Bureau of Animal Industry, these three projects:

1. Federal and State accredited pure-bred herds project.
2. The circumscribed area tuberculosis eradication project.
3. Swine tuberculosis eradication work.

The swine tuberculosis is reducing automatically with the eradication of tuberculosis in cattle. I mean by this that just in proportion as we remove tuberculosis from our cattle we will at the same time remove tuberculosis from our Minnesota swine.

Trusting that this may be of some assistance to you in an extremely important movement, I am,

Very truly,

M. H. REYNOLDS,

Member University Department of Agriculture  
and State Live Stock Sanitary Board.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Hampshire is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to rise to supplement with a word the remarks of the chairman of our committee. Well do I remember about a year ago the suggestion of the distinguished Member from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] regarding an increase of the appropriation for the eradication of tuberculosis in animals. He has worked in time and out of time almost gathering statistics and information from all parts of the country regarding this disease, and when he delivered his speech here upon this floor it was a forceful, complete, and a comprehensive presentation of the subject. As the chairman has well said, we were impressed with his remarks, his sincerity, and the ability with which he presented this subject. This year the lingering impression of his reasoning assisted the committee and we were willing and glad to increase the appropriation which we hope will result in greater benefits to the producer of beef and pork and the consumers of these food products.

CHARLES H. SLOAN leaves this body at the close of this session, and we wish he were to return and be with us during the next session. He will leave the impress of his ability, fidelity, valuable service here, which his people must admire and appreciate, and the people of the entire country will long remember him for his successful efforts in attempting to enact legislation tending to decrease the ravages of this dread and devastating disease among the live stock of our country. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise simply to say I heartily concur in what the chairman and others have said about our worthy and distinguished colleague from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN]. His ability, industry, and fidelity to duty is recognized by all, and it is due that it should be stated here that the item carried in this bill is the result of the industry and efforts of that distinguished gentleman. [Applause.]

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, last year when the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] offered the amendment for the eradication of tuberculosis, which would have very materially increased the appropriation, enough to have been ef-

fective, it gave me great pleasure to follow his leadership and to get in and make as hard a fight as I could in support of his contention. It is peculiarly gratifying to me, Mr. Chairman, to find this year he has induced the committee to appreciate the importance of the industry, which is so important to his community and to my own, and I want to thank him in behalf of the farmers of Kansas for the great aid he has given us and the country's cattle interests generally. I have seen in the newspapers of this country many criticisms of Congress and many fine suggestions, I presume, of what we ought to do here, but I am not familiar with any editorial that has ever been published that has been of such utility to the people of this country as this suggestion of the gentleman from Nebraska; and I am sorry that he has decided not to remain with us this year. As the newspapers have not been able to make any suggestions as valuable as his, I might suggest that they take up this valuable suggestion, very helpful expenditure, an idea of a Nebraska Member of this Congress, and tell the people about it. If they have any suggestions to offer equally as good, I would like to have them brought out and many of us would be glad to follow them. When we are at home we always think we can run a newspaper better than the editor can, but now that the price of paper has increased so very likely not anybody here has the qualifications to run a newspaper at all unless it is perhaps the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKINLEY]. On the other hand, the editors, by way of reciprocity, I reckon, they think they can run Congress better than Congressmen can. Perhaps there is some doubt about the correctness of that, too. And it is peculiarly pleasing to me to see one plan that after a year has fixed itself upon the House committee's bill and to anticipate the excellent results that will come from a proposition that is as beneficial as this. This plan will go far to getting rid of tuberculosis in cattle, and that will do more good for the country than any New York City daily has accomplished in 10 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 15018, a bill making appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and carrying appropriations totaling \$31,691,562 is, as far as I can see, a very meritorious measure, and yet contains matters that my conscience will not permit me to let pass without a word of protest.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN], and, coming, as I do, from an agricultural State, I am naturally in sympathy with everything he said about tuberculosis in cattle and in pigs. But tuberculosis, Mr. Chairman, is a disease that is brought about in humans by virtue of bad housing and undernourishment, and I want to know from the chairman of the Agricultural Committee, if he will give me his attention for half a minute, what he expects will result but tuberculosis to humans from a bill that contains items like \$240 a year to charwomen? I can fancy to myself a home where the woman earns \$240 annually, working as these women do, and, as I am informed, for five hours per day, and even those that are paid as high as \$300, and some of them \$360 per year—the United States Government sending women home with 60 cents per day, out of which to pay car fare and luncheon, and then working in offices and elsewhere for 60 and 70 cents a day, when at the same time we are appropriating money to destroy tuberculosis in animals.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JUUL. Just half a minute more. I do not get much time on this floor, and, while I realize that the Chairman has got to be strict in the matter of time, the hammer in my case is entirely out of order. I sit here from day to day and see men get up a hundred times a day and talk—

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has fixed the time for debate.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the time be extended so that the gentleman may have five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. If that is the case we will have to make it eight minutes. The gentleman from Maryland desires three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] asks unanimous consent—

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, there are a great many fingers going up. I wonder if we could not take the time on the next item?

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman from Illinois does not take much time.



Mr. LEVER. I appreciate that. I wondered if the gentleman could not take it on the next item just as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JUUL] be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the time be extended 10 minutes, so that the gentleman from Nebraska may have two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the time be extended 10 minutes, 5 to be occupied by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JUUL], 3 minutes by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM], and 2 by the gentleman from Nebraska. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I maintain that the Congress of the United States is placing itself in a false light before the people, particularly the working people of this country, by permitting a bill to go out with items in it like some which are contained in this bill. There is nothing else the matter with the average family when tuberculosis invades it than that they are not able to get proper nourishment and they are not able to get proper housing. I do not know what the circumstances are in a family where women are willing to tender their services for \$240 per year, but I can imagine that nothing but dire poverty compels them to accept the employment; and I would like to ask the chairman of the committee and the members of it to revise that part of the bill dealing with the charwomen.

Mr. LEVER. Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois that these \$240 charwomen are doing half-time work.

Mr. HAUGEN. And they get the benefit of the bonus also.

Mr. LEVER. And get the benefit of the bonus also.

Mr. JUUL. I would like to ask the gentlemen if these women are not required to work five hours per day, and that they must in coming and going from their places of employment pay their own car fare; and if the gentleman will take \$240 and divide the sum by 365 days he will find we are paying an amount so scant that it reflects absolutely upon the humane thoughts and feelings of this Congress to retain such items in the bill, and I sincerely hope that the gentleman, before the bill goes to final passage, will remedy this evil. It is a crying disgrace that we should sit here and pass legislation carrying items like this.

Mr. LEVER. I would say to the gentleman from Illinois that this committee some years ago, again on its own initiative, took the bit in its teeth and raised the salaries of a great many low-grade salary people. Now, without any specific information on this proposition, I am satisfied that these individuals are doing probably half-time work. The salary may be too little, and probably is too little. I think that the next Congress ought to provide some remedy for this whole question of salaries in the various departments of the Government, and I trust that a committee of the two bodies may secure the information and make a report back at the next session.

Mr. JUUL. I would like to ask the gentleman if this Government has money to stamp out tuberculosis in cattle and at the same time has no money to stamp out tuberculosis among human beings? You can not get anything else but tuberculosis out of \$240 a year for pay for a woman devoting five hours a day for 365 days a year to Government service. Allow me to tell you this, Mr. Chairman, that no woman can accept five hours per day employment from the United States Government and at the same time contract for employment elsewhere. She is barred from doing it. And I sincerely hope the gentleman will take the credit of remedying this bill instead of waiting for the Republicans to come in next year to do it.

Mr. ROSE. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. JUUL. Yes.

Mr. ROSE. I was once impressed, just as the gentleman from Illinois is. I undertook once to make an investigation of the pay of the charwomen about the House Office Building and Capitol, and I was informed that they work three hours a day at such work, leaving them the balance of the day to take up other kinds of employment. I felt satisfied the wages they were receiving were entirely too low and that they would only result in the manner the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JUUL] has suggested. I thought it might be well for the gentleman to know that one feature, that they are not working five hours per day.

Mr. HAUGEN. The salary is \$480 besides the bonus, and I submit that, considering the character of work they are doing, that salary is away above what servants are receiving in our houses when we hire charwomen at \$480 a year.

Mr. JUUL. I want to say to the gentleman that almost any servant in the house of any decent white man gets her food and lodging in addition to the wages she receives.

Mr. HAUGEN. But the charwomen get \$20 a month and \$60 bonus for the time they spend.

Mr. JUUL. If the gentlemen will kindly look at this bill, page 4, line 23, they will find 1 charwoman at \$360, 15 charwomen at \$240; and if they will look further on page 5, line 9, 1 charwoman, \$480; page 5, line 10, 5 charwomen at \$240 each.

If the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] will kindly look at his bill, page 7, line 4, he will find 1 charwoman at \$360, 3 charwomen at \$240 each. If the gentleman will take a look at page 11, line 7, he will find 16 charwomen at \$480 each, 5 charwomen at \$360 each, 2 charwomen at \$300, 7 charwomen at \$240 each; and the case becomes still more aggravated by examining page 21 and finding, in line 2 and line 3, 21 charwomen at \$240 each, and so on through the bill.

Now, if the gentlemen will take their pencils, they will find by doing a little bit of figuring that these women receive barely 66 cents a day, out of which to pay car fare, for it is reasonable to suppose that they can not afford to live on Capitol Hill out of the compensation furnished by the Government. I want to do all in my power to join the gentlemen from the country districts in stamping tuberculosis out among the farm animals, but I think we might take time occasionally listening to the voices within us that tell us that to proceed along lines here indicated is cruel, and that to sit here comfortably making appropriations for the stamping out of tuberculosis among cattle and yet denying time for those who would like to prevent the same dread disease among humans is hardly in keeping with the high standard of thought that should prevail in this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois be given one more minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has just fixed the time for debate on this paragraph.

Mr. JUUL. I suppose it will be passed now as usual.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the committee for having inserted in the bill this paragraph for the purpose of eradicating tuberculosis in cattle. I have been speaking to this House for some time about the great importance of this subject, and it is inspiring to me that the gentlemen of the committee have seen the vision. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] has done splendid work, along with the chairman of the committee, and also the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] have done good work.

I believe it is one of the most important items that this Congress will pass at this session or that has been passed at any other session. It provides for safeguarding the purity of those necessities of life which the young consume. I think that when this inspection has been in vogue for a few years, after we have been able to enforce its provisions throughout the country, the inspection will cover all milk products that are consumed by the young—not only milk in its original state but butter and cheese. We will then have been able very largely to eradicate tuberculosis throughout the United States. It is a subject in which everybody is interested. It is a subject in which we are more interested to-day, perhaps, than ever before in the history of the country, because "the boys" are coming home, many of them in a condition which needs absolute attention and pure food, so that they may not be contaminated with any diseases, and particularly with the germs of tuberculosis.

The item will go far toward perfecting the desired condition of which I have been speaking for several years. I want to extend to the American Federation of Labor, and particularly to the Federation of Labor of Maryland, my sense of appreciation of the assistance they have given in this work, in that their lodges throughout the whole United States have adopted resolutions asking Congress to provide against tuberculosis in animals. My good friend from Nebraska, Mr. SLOAN, has worked in season and out of season for this proposition, and I am sure the consumers of his State and the consumers of the entire country will appreciate his work more and more as the years roll by. It is a provision in which Congress can well feel pride in that it protects and cares for the young children who consume these products in their raw state, and particularly the sick, who are compelled to consume milk products during their illness because those products are perhaps the only things they can digest. It is a proposition which the country at large will applaud, and there will not go up a single voice from the Atlantic to the Pacific or from the Canadian boundary to the Gulf of Mexico against this proposition. [Applause.]

I tell you, gentlemen, you are building greater than you realize, and generations yet unborn will rise up to call you blessed for the protection and purification of this all-important



food product. Important to the young, when they are unable to care for themselves or look out for their interests; important to the sick, when they must rely upon the good judgment of their fellow beings for those things which they can use for their sustenance; a blessing to old age, when milk and its products perform such an important part of their daily food.

The time will come when the people will wonder why Congress delayed in the protection of the milk supply from the ravages of tuberculosis in the cattle, when they will wonder why we delayed in eradicating this dreadful disease among the cattle, in the face of medical testimony that it is largely transmitted to humanity, and when they realize that a vast part of this white plague which has ravaged man for innumerable years will have been discontinued through this protection afforded by Congress.

Not only will they appreciate the fact that you have provided against the spread of tuberculosis and the elimination thereof in the cattle, but the further fact that by the next item of your bill you have also provided for the investigation of the dairy industry and particularly for the inspection of renovated butter factories and markets. Renovated butter has perhaps carried more dirt and disease than any dairy product, second alone to infected milk. Now that you have provided for the inspection of these all-important factories I believe that the butter furnished the public will rapidly improve and that people shall again feel safe in eating that most nutritious of the milk products. Many people, by reason of cost, and sometimes by reason of fear of disease, have entirely eliminated the use of butter, and have substituted those new inventions which in many instances splendidly replace butter.

Congress saw the light in the inspection of beef; it has now seen the light and the wisdom in the protection of milk and milk products. I hail the day when the percentage of tuberculosis in cattle will be so low that it will be negligible. It is my proud privilege to again congratulate the committee and the workers of the same for the results they have brought about. It has been a long fight, but what a worthy one.

That my good friend from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] will not participate in the formation of future agricultural bills, but has voluntarily left this body, is a regret, I know, to each and every one of us. I have crossed swords with him on several occasions, fighting in the interest of the purity of milk, but I am glad to relate that it was not a difference of desire, but a difference of method only that caused these combats. To-day we stand together as one, united with the other workers for the cause in the betterment of milk and milk products and their purification. [Applause.]

I am thankful that the great war has ceased, that no longer do we murder and destroy the white races of the earth, but that conservation not alone of property but of the human race as well has begun. This appropriation will go a long way toward saving the lives of those 6,000 babies who have died from bovine tuberculosis each year. May the good work go on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, it is a great pleasure to me to listen to the compliments that are being paid to my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN]. He and I came here to Congress eight years ago and will leave at the same time. We have known each other intimately, and we have worked together for the interest of the farming communities and agricultural sections, especially in the trans-Missouri country. During that time there has been no one Member of Congress who has been more faithful to the agricultural portion of our country than my colleague from Nebraska.

When a year ago he took up this work to get an appropriation for the eradication of tuberculosis, he not only made a great speech, because he had made a careful study of the subject, but individually sought out every Member of this House and took a personal interest in the making of the appropriation. And he followed the course of that legislation to the Senate and there secured an increase of the amount which this House had given. Nebraska and every other State in this Union that is engaged in the production of cattle for human food or otherwise can be congratulated on the fact that my fellow Member from Nebraska was here and on the job attending to their needs. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for investigations and experiments in dairy industry, cooperative investigations of the dairy industry in the various States, inspection of renovated-butter factories and markets, \$350,370.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEVER offers an amendment: Page 16, line 14, after the word "markets," strike out the figures "\$350,370" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$410,370: Provided, That the sum of \$60,000 may be used for stimulating the utilization of dairy products and by-products as human food."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to enable the Department of Agriculture, through its Dairy Division, to stimulate the use of dairy products. When the food-production act was under consideration last year it carried an item of \$60,000, I think, for cottage-cheese work. That item met with a good deal of ridicule by Members of the House, but at the time I tried to impress on the House the fact that the matter of encouraging the production and use of cottage cheese alone, to say nothing of the encouragement of the use of other dairy products, would be worth the expenditure.

This is not a committee amendment. I reserved the right to offer it myself without the indorsement of the committee. The committee did not pass upon it.

I was reading one of the pamphlets of the Public Health Service the other night, where they bring out the fact very forcefully that pellagra is most likely caused by an unbalanced ration. It is caused largely by a lack of milk or lack of milk products in the diet.

Cottage cheese is one of the most delightful of all cheeses, and yet it is almost impossible to get it in the markets. The average person in the city of Washington does not know what it is and has never eaten it, and, strange to say, the great majority of farmers in this country producing milk have not brought themselves to a very large use of cottage cheese. Of course, the processes of making it are very simple. My grandmother made it when I was a boy. Yet very little of it is used in my own family now. It is hard to get. The average consumer of milk products does not know anything about it. The farmer himself does not produce it. If we could teach our farm demonstration agents to encourage the production of it, and then teach the city people to eat it in its various forms, I think we would be performing a service to this country that would be well worth the appropriation that we desire to have made for this purpose.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am told that the gentleman's amendment is largely for the purpose of promoting the use of so-called cottage cheese.

Mr. LEVER. That and all dairy products. I should say about \$25,000 would be used for that.

Mr. MANN. It may be a useful thing. I do not know. Cottage cheese happens to be an article which is recommended to me by my doctors to eat. My difficulty has been to get it.

Mr. LEVER. That is it.

Mr. MANN. I had a standing order all last summer with a high-grade dairy concern in Chicago to deliver cottage cheese to me, and I never got an ounce of it all summer.

Mr. LEVER. I got my first in Washington the other day.

Mr. MANN. What is the use of stimulating the consumption of cottage cheese when you can not get it now? It is made from surplus milk.

Mr. LEVER. That is just one part of the proposition. I want to encourage the production of cottage cheese. I want to encourage our farmers and dairymen to save this waste milk and make it into cottage cheese and also to encourage people to eat it.

Mr. MANN. Cottage cheese is something that will not keep any length of time. It has got to be used promptly when it is made. The Bureau of Food Control issued pamphlet after pamphlet—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. I do not want it extended as much as that.

Mr. MANN. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from South Carolina be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. The Bureau of Food Control issued pamphlet after pamphlet at great expense urging people to eat cottage cheese when they could not even get milk, and milk is cheaper to eat than cottage cheese. Cottage cheese is made from surplus milk. If there is an extra amount of milk, then they turn it into cottage cheese.

Mr. LEVER. It is a waste product.

Mr. MANN. I would not say a waste product.

Mr. LEVER. A by-product.

Mr. MANN. But it is rapidly taken up when you can get hold of it. Now it is proposed to spend \$60,000 to urge people to eat cottage cheese, which they can not get.

Mr. HAUGEN. Which they will not eat.

Mr. MANN. They would eat it if they could get it.

Mr. LEVER. The statement is made that last year it cost \$38,000, and that 38,000 farmers in 38 States have taken up the systematic making and use of cottage cheese on their farms. And it is certain that thousands more not heard from have done likewise.

Mr. MANN. Oh, my mother made cottage cheese when I was not that high [indicating].

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. And taught me to eat it.

Mr. LEVER. Certainly. Mine did, too. All you have to do is to take a cheesecloth bag and pour clabber milk into it and hang it up and let it drip until the next morning; then you have a very good article of cottage cheese in the bag.

Mr. MANN. But if it is more profitable to make butter, they will make butter. If it is more profitable to sell the milk, they will sell the milk.

Mr. LEVER. Very true; but they do not make cottage cheese out of the milk that they use to make butter from.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes.

Mr. LEVER. Cottage cheese is made from sour milk, or clabber milk, as we call it in our part of the country. I strongly believe that, while this matter can be easily ridiculed, I have a duty to perform. I feel very strongly that people ought to be encouraged not only to produce cottage cheese but to use it, because it is one of the most delightful of milk products. I would rather have it than butter. I would rather have it than milk, but you can not get it. The farmers do not produce it.

Mr. MANN. But cottage cheese can not be made out in the country and shipped to the city to any advantage.

Mr. LEVER. Why can not the dairies around Washington be induced to make it?

Mr. MANN. They can if they do not sell their milk at a higher rate than people would pay for cottage cheese. You can get cottage cheese at the Center Market here.

Mr. LEVER. It is hard to get.

Mr. MANN. Now, if the gentleman's proposition was to teach people to make other kinds of cheese, to make cheese that would keep, there might be something to it. I have had occasion to study the food value of various cheeses. I got a long list showing the food values of cheeses, from examinations made by the Department of Agriculture, and practically none of the cheeses mentioned are to be had. You can not find out anything about the food value of those that are to be had.

Mr. LEVER. As a matter of fact, a portion of this sum will be used to teach the people of this country to eat more cheese. On looking over this article I find that the people of the United States per capita consume less cheese than any other people in the world, and there is no reason for that except we have had other things in such great abundance.

Mr. PLATT. It seems to me it is foolish to try to teach people to make something out of waste milk when milk is selling at such a high price that all the milk will be sold and there is no waste milk. You have got to stop guaranteeing wheat at \$2.20 and get it down so that people can buy it.

Mr. LEVER. Let me suggest to the gentleman that this is anticipating peace.

Mr. PLATT. We had better wait until we get peace.

Mr. LEVER. We shall have the price of wheat taken care of pretty soon.

Mr. PLATT. Butter is so high that the people do not eat it and have to eat substitutes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Is it not a fact that cottage cheese is made from milk that has soured and that could not be disposed of otherwise, so that when it has become sour, and there is a market for cheese, it can be made into cottage cheese?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. How much was spent last year in trying to teach the people this extremely elaborate method of making cottage cheese?

Mr. LEVER. Thirty-eight thousand and some-odd dollars.

Mr. HAUGEN. I beg the gentleman's pardon, the total amount was \$65,141. The statement of Dr. Rawl, on page 32, as to this matter is as follows:

We spent on it last year—1918—out of the emergency fund, \$23,066 on the factory work, \$38,167 on the farm work, and \$3,907 on the city work, making, all told, \$65,141.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is correct. I had the figures before me, but I had not added them.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on this proposition.

Mr. LEVER. I have two minutes remaining, but I do not care to use the time now.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, as stated by the chairman of the committee, this proposition has been ridiculed in Congress, not only here, but it has been ridiculed from one end of the country to the other, and most properly so. Of all the absurd propositions ever suggested by Congress this is certainly the most ridiculous one that ever came before it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Would not the gentleman go further and say it has brought ridicule on Congress?

Mr. HAUGEN. Certainly; not only cottage cheese has been ridiculed but Members of Congress have been ridiculed as well, and properly so. As stated by the chairman, the process of making cottage cheese is very simple. On page 31 of the hearings the chairman, speaking of cottage cheese, says:

I can take an old cheesecloth and make the finest in the world.

That is all there is to making it. You remember the testimony of Dr. Rawl two years ago. He described the process. His proposition was to send out an agent to teach how to make cottage cheese, next to fill them up with cottage cheese, return in a few days and again pump them full, and to repeat the process three or four times; then it was believed, after the process had been repeated four times, that they could be made to eat that precious product. [Laughter.] We have carried this ridiculous, absurd, proposition a number of years and spent \$65,141 last year, and yet the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] says he had an order in for cottage cheese and not one pound could be procured.

We have been trying to teach people what they have known for hundreds of years. There is scarcely a woman or child in the country who does not know how to make cottage cheese. They do not make it because there is no market for it. They make all that is needed at home and all they can find a market for. As stated by one representative of the department, they did stimulate production, I believe, in Detroit, but found no market, and it was found necessary to send their agents there to stimulate a market for it.

Like many other unworthy and foolish appropriations this unfortunate child was ushered into this world. It was accepted as a war measure. Now, after masquerading as such, and now that the war is over, we find that it has not only been discredited and ridiculed in general but deserted by its own parent, Dr. Rawl. No estimates have been submitted for its continuance. It has been turned down, turned out into the cold, relegated to the rear, to be consigned into oblivion. Here it is, without parentage, without that loving protection and influence of the Department of Agriculture, and would have been left to sleep undisturbed had it not been for its godmother coming to its rescue. Through his generosity and his tender heart and sympathy for the fallen and unfortunate, he has taken this unfortunate skim-milk member of society under his protecting wing, offering it shelter and sustenance. With due regard for its present sponsor and due appreciation of his deep sympathy for the unfortunate, now that it has been given a thorough trial and has failed to make good, disowned and humiliated, I repeat it is the most absurd proposition ever suggested. Why should we make ourselves even more ridiculous?

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. If you enter upon this, why not get a judicial writ, a mandamus, and make everybody eat it?



Mr. HAUGEN. If it is necessary to make an appropriation, by all means we should make it mandatory and compel them to do so.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I trust this amendment, offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, will not be adopted. I do not oppose it altogether for the reasons suggested by other gentlemen. A year ago some attention was called to the work done by the Department of Agriculture and to the result of literature sent out urging farmers to make cheese, and to make cottage cheese of their sour milk, and the reports were very gratifying. It was shown that tons of additional food were produced—tons of nutritious and wholesome food produced during the war—practically from what would have been but for this a waste product. But the sum proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina is not necessary, because that kind of work is provided for in this and other appropriations. We are providing for the employment of a man in almost every county in the United States and for a woman in almost every county in the State, the man to advise the farmers respecting their work and the woman to advise the women as to their work in the house, the preparation and use of food, and the use of material in the making of clothes. It seems to me, if we wish to make the appropriation and provide it shall be used as the gentleman from South Carolina suggests, there will be a duplication, and I believe there would be the taking up of work that the Federal Government ought not to engage in. I doubt very much the right or authority or advisability of the Government of the United States to engage and send agents into the homes to oversee the preparation of meals, see to the making of clothing, or to aid as suggested in the bill—to go out among the people of the country and organize sewing clubs to teach the women how to sew and make the ordinary garments for members of the family.

There is a limit to Government activities—or there ought to be—and in this particular case, if this money were provided and the agents of the Government were engaged and sent out, there would be a duplication of work. Agents—men and women—are to be employed to go around now, and if they know enough to hold their jobs and earn their money they are able to give all the advice necessary as to the making of cottage cheese. In fact, advice and instruction are not necessary. If there is a demand for further production of cottage cheese, a suggestion merely is enough, because, as gentlemen on the floor have well said, every housewife in the country knows how to make cottage cheese, and knowledge of the necessity for making it for the purpose of increasing the supply of food is all that is necessary. A suggestion is enough. It is not necessary to hire men or women to invade the home, to interfere with domestic affairs, and to urge and teach the making of this product, valuable though it may be. I trust that the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. There are 100,000,000 people in the United States. Everybody knows about cottage cheese and all the difficulties there are in producing it; but does not the gentleman think it would be cruel to deny this appropriation or fail to make this appropriation which has once been utilized in instructing in the making of cottage cheese? What is going to become of the people who will get this \$50,000? There are two sides to this question, I submit to the gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It is true that during the war emergency a very large number of men and women were employed in the department, and there is a tremendous effort on the part of the department to retain their services, to find something for them to do, and money is asked in these various items in order that many of these men and women whose services are not now needed may be retained. When the Government undertakes an activity it is almost impossible to induce it to lay it aside. When a man has once attached himself to the pay roll of the Government, it takes a major surgical operation to separate him from it, although there may be absolutely no need for his services. I suggest there is no need of the services of these people and that the appropriation ought not to be made.

Several Members rose.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in—

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, it is very apparent that the committee is against this proposition. Why not have a vote upon it?

Mr. MANN. Why not withdraw it.

Mr. LEVER. Let us vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks for a vote.

Mr. HOWARD. Oh, Mr. Chairman, there is no more important question before this country, and it ought to be thoroughly debated.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard before we take a vote.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma desires to offer an amendment to the amendment. The Chair will recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the first two lines of the proposed amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, being the following language:

The figures "\$350,370," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$410,370."

And to retain the following language:

*Provided*, That the sum of \$60,000 may be used for stimulating the utilization of dairy products and by-products as human food.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that an amendment is not now in order, because a point of order is pending.

The CHAIRMAN. That is true. The Chair had overlooked the fact that a point of order is reserved against the amendment. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin insist upon the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I prefer to reserve it so as to get further information upon the subject.

Mr. LEVER. I insist that the gentleman make his point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, being of the same mind as the gentleman from South Carolina, that the sentiment of the committee is overwhelmingly opposed to this, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the disease of hog cholera and for its control or eradication by such means as may be necessary, including demonstrations, the formation of organizations, and other methods, either independently or in cooperation with farmers, associations, State or county authorities, \$641,045: *Provided*, That of said sum \$163,560 shall be available for expenditure in carrying out the provisions of the act approved March 4, 1913, regulating the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or shipment of any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product manufactured in the United States and the importation of such products intended for use in the treatment of domestic animals: *And provided further*, That of said sum \$30,620 shall be available for researches concerning the cause, modes of spread, and methods of treatment and prevention of this disease.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of having inserted in the Record at this point a letter from the Bureau of Animal Industry as to the progress of the work that has been done in respect to hog cholera during the past year. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting the data referred to. Is there objection?

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman, if the letter is not long, that it be read for the information of the House.

Mr. RUBEY. Very well. I ask that the Clerk read the letter in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY,  
Washington, D. C., January 16, 1919.

Hon. THOMAS L. RUBEY,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. RUBEY: In accordance with your telephone conversation yesterday, the following data are submitted:

The hog-cholera appropriation in the regular bill for the current year provides \$247,600 for the control of hog cholera in the field; \$32,000 for researches concerning the cause, etc., of hog cholera; and \$167,240 for regulating the preparation of hog-cholera serum and similar products. In addition, the food-production act of November 21 carries an item of \$202,965, which supplements the regular funds.

During the year ending March 31, 1914, there were 7,004,756 hogs lost from cholera, or approximately 119 hogs out of every 1,000. Through the efforts of the bureau, in cooperation with various State agencies, this loss has been gradually reduced until the death rate for the year ending March 31, 1918, was 3,280,161, or 42.1 per 1,000.

the lowest rate recorded by the department in the history of the swine industry. The aim of the bureau is to reduce these losses to a minimum, and if the funds made available by the food-production act are not continued next year the bureau will have available approximately \$250,000 for field work, or 50 per cent less than the amount that will be expended during the current fiscal year.

This work is in the nature of an investment, and it is simply a question how rapidly the Nation wishes it to develop. It is believed that an additional sum equal to the amount provided by the food-production act could be efficiently expended during 1920.

The work looking to the control of hog cholera has been continued along the general lines adopted in 1917 and has been extended from a certain number of counties in 14 States to State-wide efforts in 34 States, the work in 30 of these States consisting of control measures. In California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Utah, in addition to control work, a veterinarian has been assigned to each State with the extension division of the agricultural college, with the object of giving his entire time to educational activities in the field. In Louisiana, South Dakota, New Mexico, and West Virginia the efforts are principally educational in character.

The following information may be of interest to the committee in connection with its consideration of this matter:

Number of States in which work is conducted.....	34
Arkansas, Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Missouri, Maryland, Nebraska, North Carolina, North Dakota, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin.	
Number of veterinarians assigned.....	185
Number of investigations of reported outbreaks.....	38,046
Number of visits and interviews with farmers and stockmen.....	371,792
Number of hogs treated in connection with the work by bureau veterinarians, practicing veterinarians, and others cooperating.....	5,500,000

An important phase of the work has been to assist in formulating and applying rules and regulations covering the immunization and handling of stocker hogs at public stockyards intended for feeding purposes on farms in order that these animals may be returned to localities where feed is available without danger of spreading infection and where they may be subject to reinspection from time to time, assuring safety to the feeder while these hogs are being finished for market.

Of the 34 States in which we are working only a few are financially equipped to render any material assistance. Probably the most efficient cooperation received is the system in vogue in Missouri, where a number of practicing veterinarians are deputized by the office of the State veterinarian to assist the bureau inspectors in the investigation of outbreaks of hog cholera and the application of the serum treatment. Florida, Georgia, Arkansas, Texas, Oklahoma, Ohio, Mississippi, Kentucky, California, Kansas, and Indiana are lending material assistance, as these States have appropriated State funds for this class of work. The remaining 23 States are lending moral support only, but it is the understanding that in several of these efforts are being made to encourage the legislatures to set aside funds for the control of hog cholera.

The following are tables showing the number of hogs raised and the monetary loss from cholera for the State of Missouri and the United States extending over a period of five years.

	Hogs on farms January 1.	Hogs lost from cholera.	Monetary loss. March 31.
Missouri:			
1913.....	4,087,000	643,680	\$5,471,280
1914.....	4,250,000	344,250	2,926,125
1915.....	4,250,000	353,813	2,765,885
1916.....	4,505,000	385,178	3,334,764
1917.....	4,280,000	200,394	2,003,040
United States:			
1913.....	61,178,000	6,064,470	58,833,431
1914.....	58,933,000	6,304,320	67,697,431
1915.....	64,618,000	5,541,971	54,322,549
1916.....	67,766,000	4,057,884	33,943,443
1917.....	67,453,000	2,959,322	32,475,190

Very truly, yours,

J. R. MOHLER,  
Chief of Bureau.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, at this time I desire to express my satisfaction that the committee has wisely continued this appropriation. I think the success of the work of the National Government in the eradication of hog cholera throughout this country has been one of its most notable achievements. In nothing has the Department of Agriculture more commended itself to the farmers of the country than in this work. In nothing, I think, has there been a greater measure of success. There is now, comparatively speaking, on a percentage basis, less hog cholera in the country than there has been for probably 25 years. I think that to-day, when we have been able to reduce to the present minimum the ravages of hog cholera, we should recognize the fact, when the malady is at its lowest strength, that now is the time when we should most vigorously look to bring about its entire extinction. I am very glad indeed that the temptation that might exist, because of the small comparative amount of hog cholera in this country, to cut down the appropriation has not led the committee to make unnecessary and dangerous reductions, for I believe such reductions, if made, would lead to wider extension and greater percentage of mortality from hog cholera.

There is nothing that this country can do to reduce the high cost of living, as it pertains at least to the meats and fats, as to encourage the production of hogs in the country. Not only is it the farmers most profitable work, the most profitable stock that he can handle, but it is to the ultimate consumer the cheapest meat that he can obtain. It is the best meat that can be furnished to our armies in the field, because it can go to them in the best condition. It is not necessary that it should be refrigerated, it is not necessary that great losses should be incurred, but it can be taken to them in an appetizing, attractive form and at the same time with entire safety and without loss. So, Mr. Chairman, nothing that can be done by the Department of Agriculture, in my judgment, will be of more direct benefit to the farmers of the land than continuing this work for the purpose of saving the herds of hogs that are left in the country, and there can be nothing that would more directly contribute to this than the eradication of hog cholera. [Applause.]

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In doing this I shall not extend my speech as I did on the tuberculosis item. I have sat here under very flattering compliments of my friends and colleagues, unable to do more than blush. You know a man is not entirely bad as long as he can blush. I desire to say of this item it is important to the producing and consuming public. It gives me an opportunity to say of the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, and say it truthfully and sincerely, that one of the first important acts of his administration, really performed a few weeks before he became its active chairman, was to use the force of his influence in committee to bring about the first appropriation for this important enterprise. He will have been six years chairman of the great Agricultural Committee. The Agriculture Department has been the most progressive department of the Government, I am convinced. That never in the history of agriculture legislation did this body ever present more important measures than have been prepared in the last six years under the leadership of the able, eloquent, efficient, devoted, and patriotic chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. [Applause.] This particular item was started about the time the gentleman from South Carolina became chairman of the committee, and the results which have followed the activities are marvelous. Listen, if you will, to some figures based upon those taken from those furnished by the department, but so presented as to give a little different angle from that presented by the department's tabulations. In the United States for 29 years before this activity was begun the average annual loss was 74 per thousand. During that time the lowest loss was 49 out of every thousand, while the highest was 144.

I have from Dr. Hess an estimate of the last year's activities. The last hog year ended with March 31, 1918. Every dog has his day and a hog has his year, ending just ahead of April 1. And the rate for the last year—1918—is figured here at 36 per thousand. That is important, and more important is the following fact, that during the activities of this department, co-operating with the various States of the Union, the hog census has shown a large increase. A large increase in meat animals has not occurred anywhere in the world during the last five years except in the United States, and in the United States the increase of quadruped food-producing animals, hogs are the only kind that showed a marked increase.

In 1914 there were only 58,000,000 hogs in the United States. In 1918 there were 74,000,000 hogs. That increase occurred notwithstanding the attractive prices that had been going on and the tremendous drain of the European war. Men look at the price of their bacon and ham and say it has been high. I venture to say that if this cooperative Government and State activity had not been going on during the last five years there would have been no such encouragement to the hog producers. Instead of having 74,000,000 hogs in the United States we would have had 44,000,000. I submit to you, gentlemen, that would have made your bacon and ham twice the price you have been paying for it during the war. As a matter of preparedness for the great struggle in which the United States took its part the Committee on Agriculture and every one of its members in encouraging the production of this great product surpassed any department of the Government.

Let me call your attention to figures for a number of States. I begin with Iowa. Iowa is my native State; that is where I began. It is the greatest hog State of the Union. The average of its loss for 29 years before these activities was—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in eight minutes.



The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SLOAN. The average rate during all these years in Iowa was 89 out of every thousand. For 1912 and 1913, in which years there was no activity, it was 180 out of every thousand. The average for the last two years, namely, 1916 and 1917, under the activities in Iowa is 42 out of every thousand. During the whole period of 29 years the highest loss in Iowa was 329 out of every thousand, nearly 1 out of 3; and the lowest in that time was 42. The lowest in all its history was 35, in 1917. Figures for none of the States for 1918 are available.

I read the other day the statement of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN], the ranking member of the committee, that his county of Worth had no loss from hog cholera during the last year. He is to be congratulated on that; but I want to say that of all the diseases that inflict themselves upon the food-producing animals of the world, as was said of the serpent in the Garden, the hog cholera is the most subtle of them all. The hog-cholera germ undoubtedly knew who was going to be the chairman of the great Agricultural Committee next year. It was warned, and it stayed out of Worth County. [Laughter.]

I here present similar statements from 9 other States of the Union. These with Iowa in their order constitute the 10 States that produce more than half the hogs in the country:

## ILLINOIS.

Average loss per thousand for 29 years before national activities	90
Average for 1912 and 1913	100
Average for 1916 and 1917	63
Lowest for 29 years before activities	41
Highest for same period	242
Lowest in history (in 1917)	36

## NEBRASKA.

Average loss for 29 years before activities	87
Average for 1912 and 1913	80
Average for 1916 and 1917	40
Lowest for 29 years before activities	36
Highest same period	170
Lowest in history, 1917 (except 1911)	40

## INDIANA.

Average for 29 years	79
Average for 1912 and 1913	130
Average for 1916 and 1917	75
Lowest for 29 years	30
Highest	238
Lowest (recent history), 1917	50

## MISSOURI.

Average for 29 years	90
Highest	200
Lowest	44
Average for 1912 and 1913	155
Average for 1916 and 1917	74
Lowest in recent history (1917)	53

## OHIO.

Average, 29 years	53
Highest, 29 years	108
Lowest, 29 years	33
Average for 1912 and 1913	72
Average for 1916 and 1917	50
Lowest in history (1917)	34

## TEXAS.

Average, 29 years, for activities	60
Lowest	30
Highest	200
Average, 1912 and 1913	37
Average, 1916 and 1917	48
Loss for 1917	42

## GEORGIA.

Average for 29 years	96
Highest	150
Lowest	50
Average for 1912 and 1913	119
Average for 1916 and 1917	78
Loss for 1917	76

Estimated number of hogs in each State on Jan. 1, and losses from hog cholera for year ending Mar. 31, 1913 to 1917.

State.	1917		1916		1915		1914		1913	
	Hogs on hand.	Losses from cholera.	Hogs on hand.	Losses from cholera.	Hogs on hand.	Losses from cholera.	Hogs on hand.	Losses from cholera.	Hogs on hand.	Losses from cholera.
Iowa	9,370,000	337,320	9,069,000	448,915	8,720,000	1,216,440	6,976,000	1,601,010	8,720,000	1,255,680
Illinois	4,444,000	163,984	4,489,000	404,010	4,358,000	470,664	4,358,000	549,090	4,315,000	543,690
Nebraska	4,306,000	174,514	4,266,000	191,970	3,809,000	385,661	3,228,000	508,410	3,798,000	376,021
Missouri	4,290,000	200,304	4,505,000	385,178	4,250,000	353,813	4,250,000	344,250	4,087,000	643,680
Indiana	3,970,000	214,380	4,010,000	408,783	4,167,000	457,537	3,969,000	482,220	3,709,000	500,760
Ohio	3,527,000	120,623	3,713,000	250,628	3,640,000	262,080	3,467,000	265,230	3,399,000	265,070
Texas	3,229,000	136,587	3,197,000	172,633	2,880,000	174,960	2,618,000	176,763	2,493,000	100,980
Georgia	2,585,000	198,120	2,348,000	190,188	2,042,000	165,402	1,945,000	157,503	1,888,000	280,353
Kansas	2,535,000	63,882	2,815,000	159,611	2,656,000	144,619	2,350,000	122,670	2,611,000	281,970
Wisconsin	2,060,000	48,204	2,142,000	48,195	2,255,000	76,106	2,050,000	92,230	2,030,000	51,120

## UNITED STATES.

Average loss for 29 years before activities	74
Average for 1912 and 1913	94
Average for 1916 and 1917	44
Lowest for 29 years before activities began	40
Highest, same period	144
Lowest in history (1918)	36

## Hog census since activities began.

1914	58,933,000
1915	64,618,000
1916	67,766,000
1917	67,453,000
1918	74,324,000

As I said before, referring to different sections, two of these States are those that are not usually considered hog States. Georgia and Texas are on that list. So that what was said about the cattle is going to be true about the swine. The United States in the years to come, under these two great activities, will look to the Southland for its beef and for its pork nearly as much as it has heretofore been looking for its cotton.

Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the Record by presenting a number of statistics which I have figured out myself, and a communication from Dr. Hess of the Department of Agriculture, who has special charge of this work, and to insert some other matters that I think would be pertinent to the subject under consideration.

The following embodies facts and views of Dr. Hess, who has charge of cholera eradication work in the Bureau of Animal Industry, and is entitled to great credit for his industry and achievements:

The work of controlling hog cholera has extended from experiments in three counties in 1913 to State-wide activities in 34 States, comprising the principal hog-raising sections of the country. The work in its present scope involves sanitary surveys, the investigation of reported outbreaks of hog cholera, supervising and assisting in the treatment of infected herds, cleaning and disinfecting premises, establishing quarantine when necessary, applying State and Federal regulations, and furnishing assistance and advice to farmers, stockmen, practicing veterinarians, and others concerning the proper disposal of dead animals and methods of prevention and control of hog cholera.

An important phase of the work has been to assist in formulating and applying State and Federal rules and regulations that require the immunization and proper handling at public stockyards of stocker hogs intended for feeding purposes on farms, in order that they may be returned to localities where feed is available without danger of spreading infection. These animals are subject to reinspection from time to time, thus assuring safety to the feeder while the hogs are being finished for market.

The following States are receiving the benefit of the work: Arkansas, Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Missouri, Maryland, Nebraska, North Carolina, North Dakota, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

For the year ending March 31, 1914, out of a hog population of 61,178,000, cholera destroyed 118 in every 1,000, or a total of 7,204,756. March 31, 1918, according to the Bureau of Crop Estimates of the Department of Agriculture, there were on the farms of the United States 74,324,000 hogs. Assuming that these hogs were marketed at an average weight of 200 pounds each, they would return to the producers not less than two and a quarter billion dollars, or approximately one-third of the largest loan ever floated during the history of the Government. Through the efforts of the Bureau of Animal Industry, in co-operation with State authorities, losses have been reduced over 60 per cent, or to 42 per 1,000, in the year 1918.

Even though the number of hogs lost has been greatly reduced, the monetary loss is still great, owing to the high value of this class of animals, and particularly at this time and stage of development of this very important industry we can not afford to neglect the protection which this hog-cholera work is offering. The monetary loss from hog cholera for last year, although the number of hogs lost was greatly reduced, represents probably seventy-five times the amount that is being asked for for the continuation of this work, or sufficient to maintain the work in its present scope for a period of more than 60 years. Without the protection that has been provided to the swine industry, the millions of pounds of pork products that have been added to the Nation's supply, through the increased number of hogs raised during the period of the war, would not have been possible.

The following is a table taken from Farmers' Bulletin 834, prepared by Drs. Marion Dorset and O. B. Hess. It may be proper to state that Dr. Dorset was one of the scientists who discovered and developed the hog-cholera serum.

Estimated number of hogs in each State on Jan. 1, and losses from hog cholera for year ending Mar. 31, 1913 to 1917—Continued.

State.	1917		1916		1915		1914		1913	
	Hogs on hand.	Losses from cholera.	Hogs on hand.	Losses from cholera.	Hogs on hand.	Losses from cholera.	Hogs on hand.	Losses from cholera.	Hogs on hand.	Losses from cholera.
Alabama.....	1,850,000	116,550	1,715,000	100,328	1,559,000	115,796	1,485,000	133,650	1,456,000	144,180
Minnesota.....	1,733,000	34,313	1,716,000	46,332	1,716,000	188,417	1,430,000	275,400	1,702,000	84,240
Mississippi.....	1,698,000	99,333	1,617,000	87,318	1,540,000	180,180	1,467,000	137,340	1,482,000	205,380
Louisiana.....	1,584,000	149,688	1,553,000	118,805	1,412,000	133,434	1,398,000	157,320	1,412,000	139,770
Kentucky.....	1,589,000	85,806	1,709,000	107,667	1,582,000	113,904	1,507,000	122,040	1,638,000	140,040
Arkansas.....	1,575,000	184,275	1,589,000	154,451	1,573,000	173,929	1,498,000	168,480	1,529,000	220,140
North Carolina.....	1,550,000	69,750	1,550,000	72,045	1,525,000	68,625	1,392,000	61,290	1,335,000	69,660
Tennessee.....	1,485,000	101,574	1,531,000	115,744	1,501,000	131,037	1,390,000	137,610	1,495,000	133,200
South Dakota.....	1,432,000	34,797	1,314,000	47,304	1,195,000	145,193	1,039,000	215,100	1,181,000	40,410
Michigan.....	1,345,000	30,263	1,462,000	47,369	1,392,000	61,387	1,313,000	73,263	1,313,000	47,250
Oklahoma.....	1,372,000	55,566	1,491,000	112,720	1,420,000	98,403	1,352,000	85,140	1,325,000	96,570
Pennsylvania.....	1,174,000	36,981	1,210,000	30,492	1,186,000	37,359	1,130,000	42,753	1,130,000	43,740
Florida.....	1,100,000	99,000	996,000	98,604	949,000	111,333	904,000	122,040	878,000	134,370
Virginia.....	1,023,000	34,987	1,023,000	43,273	956,000	40,009	869,000	36,003	836,000	35,000
California.....	994,000	31,311	947,000	34,944	877,000	37,097	797,000	37,980	822,000	36,990
South Carolina.....	920,000	36,432	870,000	41,265	819,000	42,383	780,000	45,630	765,000	51,660
New York.....	759,000	13,662	799,000	16,539	768,000	19,008	753,000	21,690	761,000	20,520
North Dakota.....	650,000	17,550	706,000	17,791	642,000	29,757	428,000	28,890	366,000	6,570
West Virginia.....	380,000	9,918	378,000	15,309	374,000	15,481	367,000	15,483	356,000	23,493
Maryland.....	359,000	19,063	370,000	23,909	349,000	23,871	332,000	23,310	335,000	27,180
Colorado.....	352,000	8,870	320,000	7,776	256,000	5,990	205,000	4,593	205,000	18,450
Oregon.....	315,000	5,670	370,000	8,910	360,000	7,290	300,000	5,403	268,000	7,203
Idaho.....	292,000	5,256	344,000	10,836	328,000	12,543	252,000	11,340	233,000	7,740
Washington.....	283,000	4,075	314,000	5,087	327,000	5,592	284,000	5,139	258,000	5,139
Montana.....	269,000	5,568	298,000	5,900	276,000	6,458	184,000	4,930	153,000	2,790
New Jersey.....	163,000	4,401	161,000	7,535	161,000	7,390	158,000	7,110	160,000	5,760
Vermont.....	113,000	2,543	113,000	2,034	108,000	2,430	106,000	2,883	107,000	1,893
Massachusetts.....	112,000	2,520	112,000	3,024	108,000	3,645	106,000	4,320	115,000	4,140
New Mexico.....	101,000	1,273	91,000	1,065	73,000	1,117	56,000	1,089	52,000	1,263
Utah.....	101,000	2,000	112,000	2,923	98,000	2,693	85,000	2,430	81,000	1,800
Maine.....	100,000	1,800	102,000	2,203	95,000	3,591	97,000	5,220	101,000	2,520
Arizona.....	80,000	2,160	40,000	720	31,000	1,046	24,000	1,170	23,000	270
Wyoming.....	69,000	745	70,000	630	64,000	864	51,000	900	41,000	540
Delaware.....	60,000	3,240	61,000	3,569	60,000	3,375	58,000	3,150	58,000	2,610
Connecticut.....	58,000	783	59,000	958	58,000	1,383	57,000	1,800	58,000	1,620
New Hampshire.....	53,000	954	55,000	1,040	52,000	1,310	51,000	1,620	52,000	1,170
Nevada.....	37,000	500	40,000	1,044	36,000	1,037	33,000	1,080	32,000	630
Rhode Island.....	14,000	227	15,000	311	15,000	324	14,000	360	14,000	360
United States.....	67,453,000	2,959,322	67,766,000	4,057,884	64,618,000	5,541,971	58,933,000	6,304,320	61,178,000	6,064,470

On hand March 31, 1918, 74,324,000. Losses from cholera year ending March 31, 1918, 2,701,825 hogs.

In this connection I desire especially to thank the members of the committee and others who have said the beautiful, complimentary, and flattering things concerning myself. I expect to leave Congress at the end of this term, voluntarily of course. Having always while here been a minority member, that meant pulling hard against the stream. I have tried during all that time in a modest way to impress some of my views upon constructive legislation. It is difficult to establish credit to much accomplishment, but among the measures of constructive legislation for the good of the whole country, while having special application to my own district and State, I consider having a creditable part in starting the two great National and State cooperative enterprises, namely, to eradicate hog cholera and tuberculosis, among the best measures upon which I lavished my study and industry. I shall leave behind me, I trust, many friends upon this floor upon either side of this great party aisle. I am convinced that if the future of this Republic is left to Members such as we have now and will have in the coming Congress, and they live up to their great opportunities, duties, and responsibilities, the measure of the years of the Republic has not been taken, nor will it until many centuries have been added to our history. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. CRISP having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12001) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, approved March 3, 1911."

The message also announced that the Senate had further insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 11984) to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent censuses disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. ASHURST, and Mr. LA FOLLETTE as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Meat inspection, Bureau of Animal Industry: For additional expenses in carrying out the provisions of the meat-inspection act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stats L. 674), there is hereby appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the sum of \$803,060: *Provided*, That hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, in his discretion, to pay employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry employed in establishments subject to the provisions of the meat-inspection act of June 30, 1906, for all overtime work performed at such establishments, at such rates as he may determine, and to accept from such establishments wherein such overtime work is performed reimbursement for any sums paid out by him for such overtime work.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out all the language after the word "determine," on line 3, page 19, down to and including the word "work," in line 6.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MADDEN: Page 19, line 3, after the word "determine," strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, when the meat-inspection law was first passed, as the result of a nation-wide agitation, the then President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, anxious to see that American meats were prepared in such form as to be acceptable to the meat buyers of the world, fearful that Congress would fail to appropriate the needed money, suggested that the cost of the inspection should be paid by the packers. The reply to the suggestion was that the payment of the inspection cost by the packers would indicate that the inspection was a packers' inspection. The law provides that every packer who fails or refuses to pack the meats according to the regulations commits a crime, for which he is liable to be punished.

I take it that the meat inspector is nothing more nor less than a detective, although he has special knowledge of the manner in which the meat should be packed. But the main purpose for the employment of the inspector is to see that the meat is so packed as to comply with the law, and for failure to pack the meat in such form it is his business to accumulate evidence to be used in the courts against the man who violates the law.

Now, who is liable to violate the law? Is it not the packer? And if the packer is called upon to pay any part of the compensation of the inspector, you have taken away the incentive of the inspector to see that the law is observed. And you have



also compelled the man who may commit the crime to pay the man who is employed to get evidence against him, if I may so put it, to furnish the evidence upon which to convict himself. And this provision of the law reported by the committee would do just that.

Now, I maintain that this is an iniquitous suggestion. If the men who are employed by the Government of the United States to inspect the packing of the meats to be consumed by the people of the United States or by the meat users of the world are entitled to overtime pay, the Government of the United States ought to pay them. And I have no objection to their payment for overtime; but I do object to placing the matter of the payment of these men for overtime work in the hands of the men whom they are employed to accumulate evidence against in case of their failure to pack the meats as they should be packed according to the provisions of the law.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Does the Government pay or the packer pay for the time that is not overtime?

Mr. MADDEN. The Government pays. And if the Government did not pay, the inspection would not be considered worth a cent anywhere in the world. Why, everybody knows if the packers were permitted to pay, the people everywhere would consider it a packers' inspection and not work on the paper it was written on.

When this law was up for consideration originally I recall that President Roosevelt sent for me to talk the matter over. He said then that he wanted a provision placed in the bill to provide that the packers should pay the cost of the inspection, and that the amount of money received from that source should be placed in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, to be used by him without being appropriated by Congress. And he wanted me to support it. I said, "I will not do it. The proposal that you make is untenable."

The people of England fought for 400 years to take the power away from the King to expend money that was not appropriated by Parliament, and at the end of the 400 years' fight the people won, and the King of England has never had the power to expend any money since that time except such money as was appropriated by the Parliament. When we organized this Government we included a provision in the Constitution of the United States that no executive officer of the Government should expend money except that appropriated by the Congress. And the Secretary of Agriculture ought not to be permitted to expend any money received from any source that does not go through the Treasury of the United States and which is reappropriated by the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MADDEN. And this item here, although the money would go into the Treasury of the United States if it was received from the packers, and be paid by the Government from those receipts, yet it is an indirect payment of the men by the packers for the overtime work they are called upon to do. And it is not the way to do the business. If the Government of the United States feels that its employees are entitled to more compensation for additional work done, then the Treasury of the United States ought to be drawn against for what it costs, and no outside interest should be compelled or required or permitted to contribute any part of the money necessary to be paid for that purpose except through the ordinary methods of taxation.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TOWNER. Is it not within the power of the packers under the arrangements for inspection that they can in fact determine how much overtime work is performed and when the overtime work shall be performed, so that it is within their power to favor or not to favor the men who are inspecting the meat products?

Mr. MADDEN. That may be the case. I really do not know. But the main thing with me is that I object to any private individual being required or permitted to pay any part of the Government expense for men who are employed to inspect the work which those private individuals are called upon to do.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I was a member of the Committee on Agriculture, a new member, when the original meat-inspection law was passed. The contest in committee was as has been described by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], namely,

as to who should pay the expense of inspection. It was a contest long drawn out and bitterly fought. I remember the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, a Member of the House, came before the Committee on Agriculture and made a very earnest plea for some action at the hands of the committee.

When this proposition first came to my attention I felt exactly as the gentleman from Illinois does about it. I felt that it would be a most unwise policy to have the packers pay the expense of this overtime, but after looking into the matter I saw that the payment was so indirect that there could not be any possible influence upon the character of the work of the inspection force. We had before the committee Dr. Mohler, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and we cross-examined him at considerable length, and he informed us that the Canadian Government has exactly the same system, recently put in force, for the packers to pay the overtime work. And the Canadian officials have recently informed him that the system works beautifully.

These inspectors, these employees of the Government at the packing houses, frequently work from 7 o'clock in the morning until 8 o'clock at night. There is no incentive on the part of the packing establishments to speed up their work. They may keep these men there as long as they please.

I feel now, after thoroughly considering the matter, that it would very much inure to the benefit of the inspector himself; it would save him time. It would really reduce overtime work in these packing houses if the packer himself is made to pay the burden of the expense of the overtime work. If the proposition were to pay these men directly, I would oppose it just as vigorously as the gentleman from Illinois. But the payment for this overtime work is turned over to the Secretary of Agriculture. He must accept and pay for this overtime just as he does under the present law, and I do not see how there can be any possible influence by the packer over the inspector by an arrangement of that kind. For example, one or two years ago in the Forest Service we permitted certain lumber companies to cover into the Treasury, or we allowed the Secretary of Agriculture to accept from these lumber companies, payment for brush being burned. It is a matter of similar nature, and no harmful results have come from that kind of an arrangement.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. There is quite a difference between the burning of brush and the packing of meats that all the people of the world must use, and the value of the inspection depends upon whether it is a Government inspection or a private individual's inspection.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I appreciate that, and the whole inspection law is based on that theory. If this in any wise would break down the inspection service of the country, I would be opposed to it, but I do not think it can possibly do so.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. Does not the gentleman think that if it becomes generally understood that the packers pay in part at least for the inspection it will militate against their faith in the efficiency of the inspection in the eyes of purchasers all over the world?

Mr. LEVER. I do not see how that can be possible, because the whole inspection proposition is under the Government control all the time. These inspectors are very carefully supervised in their work. They have their efficiency commissions and all that kind of thing, which makes it certain that the inspection will be efficient.

I am informed from the testimony that the overtime work is now costing \$345,275 a year, and that would be the expense that the Government would have to pay if it paid for overtime.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. It is not a question of the amount involved. The amount involved ought not to make any difference. It is the moral side of the question that is under discussion here, and that is the only side that ought to receive consideration.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Can the gentleman inform me if there is any other food industry in the United States that is examined or that has this inspection system for which the Government pays?

Mr. LEVER. Well, the enforcement of the food and drugs act, of course, is paid for by the Government. We have inspectors who go into the markets and get samples and see whether there is adulteration or misbranding. But there is no other Government service just like this meat-inspection service.

Mr. SABATH. This applies to the meat industry of the United States?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Is this amount of \$803,960 the entire amount that the Government expends on the meat-inspection service?

Mr. LEVER. No. The original law carries an annual appropriation of \$3,000,000.

Mr. SABATH. This is additional to the \$3,000,000?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. This is put in here for the purpose of providing additional inspectors, and also for the purpose of increasing the salaries of some of the low-grade inspectors.

Mr. SABATH. And all you desire is that the industry pay that small portion which is being paid in addition to the regular service of those who are obliged to work overtime?

Mr. LEVER. That is all that there is to this proposition.

Mr. LOBECK. It says here—

Total for Bureau of Animal Industry, \$5,127,033.

Mr. LEVER. That includes this and other activities of the Bureau of Animal Industry. The total for meat inspection, if this item passes, will be \$3,803,960.

Mr. MADDEN. It was \$3,000,000 to begin with.

Mr. LEVER. It was \$3,000,000 to begin with, and this is an additional appropriation.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, when the meat-inspection law was enacted, as stated by the gentleman from Illinois, it was provided that the Government should pay the expense of inspection. We were confronted with this situation: Limited appropriations were made. The appropriations were inadequate to meet the demand, and as a result certain packers—in most instances the large packers—were provided with inspection. The smaller plants throughout the country were not provided with inspection. The suggestion was either that the Government make adequate appropriations or that it permit the packers to pay for the inspection. They objected to coming before Congress every year on bended knees and asking for these small appropriations. It was then suggested that a permanent appropriation be made large enough to meet the expense for all time to come. The chief of the bureau estimated that \$1,800,000 would meet the demand. Later he revised the estimate to \$2,200,000, and it was suggested that a permanent appropriation be made of \$3,000,000, so that that question would never arise, but every packer would be supplied with the inspection. We have met that demand, but the business has so grown that it now requires about \$4,000,000. Now, it is suggested that all the packers be treated alike. Each packer is to be provided with inspection on an eight-hour schedule, and if additional service is required or desired it is proposed that the packers are to pay that additional amount, or pay for the overtime. As suggested here, the \$400,000 is, of course, a small percentage of \$4,000,000. We are simply following the policy of Canada, and following the policy adopted as to other inspections.

Mr. LOBECK. I move to strike out the last word. I should like to ask the chairman a question. In the report here it says:

There is an apparent increase in this item of \$326,760, but, as \$27,720 has been transferred to statutory rolls, there is an actual increase of \$354,480. This sum will be used for increasing the salaries of 2,932 employees of the meat-inspection service by \$120 per annum each and of 11 employees of said service by \$240 per annum each.

Why the difference?

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman mean between \$120 and \$240?

Mr. LOBECK. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Those 11 men are higher-salaried men.

Mr. RUBEN. The others get the benefit of the \$120 bonus.

Mr. LEVER. We just give these 11 men \$240 and the others get the \$120 bonus.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, by this section I judge that the Secretary of Agriculture has the power to determine the wage to be paid. I am glad to see that he has that power, because for several years past I have taken an active interest in it to see that in some way these lay meat inspectors and veterinarians were paid a reasonable wage for their work. Therefore I am glad to vote for this section, for it does look to me like the Secretary of Agriculture has been given the power in this portion of the Agricultural bill to get a reasonable inspection and to pay a reasonable and equitable wage for the meat inspection and that the men may get a living wage for work and service rendered. In the Sixty-fourth Congress I made untiring and per-

sistent efforts to get the Lobeck bill passed, which would classify the wage of the inspectors and veterinarians. The opposition to the bill was very active, and finally, on account of the limited time for discussion in the House, it did not come to a vote and under the rules the Agricultural Committee could not have another day for consideration. During the Sixty-fifth Congress, on account of war legislation no classification bills or scarcely any legislation not known as war legislation has been enacted into law. Therefore I am glad to be present to-day and by my voice and vote favor this legislation, which, I hope, will be of real value to these men, who are and have been rendering valuable and splendid service to the inspection bureau of the Bureau of Animal Industry.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak to the amendment for just a moment, because I think it is a very wise amendment, and I believe if you want to keep the inspectors independent of the packing influence this is one of the ways of doing it, because I am of the opinion that nothing would suit the packers better than to have the privilege of providing for the overtime for these inspectors. For that reason I hope the amendment will pass.

Mr. CANNON. I have just come in. What is the amendment?

Mr. LEVER. The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] would compel the Government to pay for the overtime proposition.

Mr. CANNON. Then, if I understand it, the provision as reported by the committee appropriates for eight hours' work, for reasons that I have heard assigned here, so that the packers can not tamper with them. But for overtime, which is time and a half, as I understand it, the packers are to pay; so that the Government would pay part and the packers would pay part. It seems to me that there is no sound reason why the packers would not pay all or the Government pay all.

Mr. LEVER. There is this distinction between overtime work and regular work: Overtime work is more largely in the interest of the packers than it is in the interest of the public. The packer has a large accumulation of hogs or cattle on hand, and he wants to get rid of them. He wants to have them butchered, but must have them inspected before and after they are slaughtered. Therefore he works these inspectors overtime. For that reason I think he should bear some of the expense of the benefit we are giving him.

Mr. CANNON. After all is said and done, if it would work harm to pay for eight hours, because it might put the inspector under an unworthy influence, it would work harm to pay for time and a half for over eight hours, so far as I can see.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The idea is to have the packers pay, everything or the Government pay everything.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely. It ought to be one way or the other.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I have no objection to the packers paying it all, if you want to put it on the packers, but it is a matter of principle.

Mr. LOBECK. The fact is the people have got to pay it finally anyway.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, on January 27 there was an article printed in the Washington Post, written by Mr. Herbert Hoover, which was an interesting discussion of some farmers' problems. In that article he makes this statement:

If the farmers' prices threaten to fall below the level of a fair return, it behooves the country to do some quick, clear thinking.

And he goes on to discuss some problems of marketing of cattle and hogs in connection with the packing industry. The packers are not the only offenders. The men who trade with them, the commission men at the stockyards, often treat the shippers very unfairly.

I want to call the attention of the House to one particular case. A farmer in North Dakota made a shipment of his cattle to St. Paul, to George Hawkinson. The farmer followed up the shipment and reached St. Paul the morning after the cattle had arrived. He called to see Mr. Hawkinson before the market opened, and Mr. Hawkinson told him that he had sold the cattle for 6½ cents a pound. A little later he walked over to the cattle yards to see where the cattle were. He found them in one yard not mixed in with other cattle. Another commission man belonging to the same board or exchange came along and the farmer said, "How much can I buy these cattle for?" He said, "I just sold them for 8 cents a pound." The farmer said, "I guess you are making good money, for I sold them at 6½ cents a pound." "Well," he said, "you know I had to mix them with other cattle to bring them up." The farmer examined them and found every single one in the yard was



marked with his brand and there were no other cattle mixed with them. This figured up a loss to him of \$2,000 on that one shipment of 130-odd cattle.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. That is just a case of an ordinary crook handling this fellow's stock.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes; an ordinary shyster, as my father would say.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. The farmer consigned them to a crook.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Does the gentleman find that condition in his section of the country?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Oh, we run into crooks sometimes down there.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Do you not think that Congress ought to give some attention to this when we are trying to find out why things are costing so much?

Mr. LOBECK. Are not the stockyards of St. Paul under the regulation of the State of Minnesota, giving them the privilege to do business and coming before the legislature every year as to the price they can charge for corn, hay, and feed?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I presume, like other stockyards, it is under regulation by the State, and now it gets some regulation under the license system.

Mr. LOBECK. We had hearings whether the Government should take over the stockyards and run them themselves.

Mr. HAUGEN. They have taken them over to the extent of licensing them.

Mr. LOBECK. I have seen the time when I proposed to sell and my commission man said I could get a better price the next day, but it did not turn out so.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The facts concerning the case I have just been telling about are set forth in a letter from U. L. Burdick, a prominent and successful stockman of Williams County, N. Dak., to the Equity Cooperative Exchange of St. Paul, Minn. This concern is sound financially, with capital of upward of \$2,000,000, and is honestly managed. It is owned by farmers—a great many of them—each one owning a small portion of the capital. This concern, having done a successful business at St. Paul and performing there a real service for northwestern stock raisers, has recently opened a branch at the Union Stockyards, Chicago, Ill., under the management of an old and trusted friend of mine, Fred E. Osborne. If the stockmen generally knew about this honest and efficient farmers' agency there would be no trouble, but many of them do not, particularly in the Chicago territory. It seems to me steps should be taken to prevent a return after the war to conditions which obtained in the stockyards prior to the war. I ask for permission to print the letter of Mr. Burdick in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LETTER OF U. L. BURDICK.

WILLISTON, N. DAK., February 5, 1918.

Mr. F. B. WOOD,  
Manager Live Stock Department, Equity Cooperative Exchange,  
South St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR SIR: Referring to the report that I shipped you 130 head of steers last September and that I lost approximately \$2,000 on them, I wish to state that this is not true as to the first part of the proposition. I have never shipped you any cattle at any time. The second part of the proposition is true, and the facts are as follows:

On or about the 1st day of September, 1917, I shipped to South St. Paul 130 head of steers, all branded with U bar on the right shoulder, same being a brand I use in Williams County, N. Dak.

In making up my mind where to ship these cattle, I at once decided to ship them to an old friend of mine—George Hawkinson, of South St. Paul. These steers would average about 900 pounds on the first 75 head and probably 750 pounds, or thereabouts, on the balance.

I arrived at the South St. Paul stockyards at 9.30 a. m. on the day which the cattle were sold, and at once went to the yards of the Hawkinson Commission Co. I arrived there before the general market had opened up, or at least had apparently opened up. When I came I was informed by Mr. Hawkinson that he had sold the cattle—to whom I did not know; that he had sold them at \$6.75 for the top end and \$6.25 for the poor end. I was, of course, surprised at the sale, but as I had consigned them to him I did not think at the time that I could stop the sale.

I investigated the market and found on that day that the general run of prices for the top end of my bunch was 8 cents. I then investigated to find out where the cattle were, and discovered that Mr. Hawkinson had sold them to Paul Thuet. In company with Peter Knutson, of Williston, N. Dak., I then went to the Thuet yards, and, as he did not know me, I looked over my own cattle and asked him what he would take for them. He said, "I have just sold them to a party in Iowa for 8 cents." I said, "That is pretty good business. I just got \$6.75 for the same bunch." He said, "Well, of course, I had to mix them with other cattle to bring the grade up." I examined the bunch and found that every single steer in the pens had the U-bar brand on them. I said, "Mr. Thuet, you know you lie when you say you had to mix the bunch, because you couldn't brand them and have the brands heal up on them within one hour."

I have not calculated to the exact figure just how much I lost on this transaction, but approximately \$2,000 on the bunch.

I then discovered that Paul Thuet made a regular business of making rounds of the stockyards early on market days and buying up all the cattle he could buy, taking them over to his pens and reselling them on the same day. I presume, while I don't know, that I am not the only

victim of the speculator who operates on the South St. Paul stock market.

I complained of the same to Mr. Hawkinson, but he said to me that he got all the cattle were worth. I asked him why it was, then, that the general price of cattle on that day (which anyone can now look up) for the same class of cattle was approximately 8 cents. "Well," he said, "cattle vary so much. Your cattle were not extra good ones." I replied that they were fat and averaged 900 pounds. "Well," he said, "I did the best I could, and I am sorry that you lost so much money, but if you will ship to me again I will do my best to make a sale next time that will represent the full value of the cattle."

Very truly, yours,

(Signed)

U. L. BURDICK.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I also desire to call attention to a plan for correcting the abuses of future selling on the great exchanges prepared by Gen. A. P. Peake, of Valley City, N. Dak. During the war we have not had occasion to give much attention to this subject, because the exchanges have been closed as to option trading in wheat. At the end of this crop year we may face lower prices for wheat, and it behooves the wheat growers and those who represent them to study out or work out some plan to put a stop to gambling in the market places. Gen. Peake, who has made a special study of this subject, believes that any plan adopted should protect both the farmers and the flour millers. He believes that any injury to the flour industry will be reflected back to the wheat growers. He therefore proposes that the flour millers and others legitimately connected with the trade shall be permitted to make contracts for future delivery of grain under conditions which will prevent uneconomic speculation. In order that Members may have the opportunity of examining Gen. Peake's plan, I desire to have permission to print the same in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### GEN. PEAKE'S PLAN FOR PREVENTION OF SHORT SELLING OF GRAIN.

Situation: Farm products are now unprotected against short selling of nonexistent quantities by speculators.

Problem: To prevent the selling of contracts for future delivery of nonexistent grain and other farm products without interfering unduly with hedging by warehousemen and grinders, including country and terminal elevators, mills, and packers.

Solution of problem proposed:

First. Provide a form of warehouse receipt signable by the bonded agents of elevators, packers, and mills.

Second. Provide that any sale contract made on any grain or produce exchange or branch office thereof for sale of any farm product for future delivery must be completed by the delivery to the clearing house of such exchange within five days from date of such sale contract of a warehouse receipt showing such grain or produce actually in store, in a warehouse, or terminal or country elevator in charge of a bonded agent.

Third. Provide rules for the conduct of exchange clearing houses which will compel the keeping of such a file and record of warehouse receipts that the gross amount of warehouse receipt covering grain or produce in any warehouse or elevator will be shown by balance each day in so far as that exchange is concerned.

Fourth. Provide that the warehouse receipts contain an agreement for the payment of delivery charges to contract point by outside warehouses and elevators.

Fifth. Provide for inspection of files, records, and warehouses by agent of the Department of Agriculture and for frequent reports to said department, arranging severe penalties for allowing warehouse receipts to remain in exchange clearing houses after grain or produce is shipped beyond the period necessary to deliver grain or produce at the terminal where the contract provides for delivery.

Sixth. Provide penalties for failure to comply with these rules, including the forfeiture of contract, heavy fines, and imprisonment.

Suggestions: To allow mills to continue selling wheat to hedge flour, it might be made allowable for them to have warehouse receipts issued for wheat at the rate of 3½ bushels per barrel of flour.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman, if he will yield, that the transaction such as he has narrated, in my judgment, if it took place in the Chicago Live Stock Exchange and became known, the men who participated in it would be expelled promptly from membership of the exchange, because the whole basis is the personal honesty of the men who operate the live stock exchange in buying and selling cattle, and without it they can not do business very long.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanims consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, this is an age when legislators must recognize as they have never recognized before the necessity of doing impartial justice to the man who works for a living, and particularly the man who works in the great industries.

I have the honor to represent a constituency containing 200,000 working men and women, and it is the center of one of the most important industries in the entire world. I represent the voters of that great district, the men who send me here, and in no sense do I hold a brief for the great packers and the packing industries, yet I believe it to be my duty and privilege to see



that these industries are both fairly and justly dealt with. The immediate question—overtime and increased compensation for the employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry—has been thoroughly discussed by the Members, and I believe the consensus of opinion is that both the overtime and the increased compensation should be granted, as asked in the bill before the House.

Mr. Chairman, I take it that the committee itself wishes the House not to show any partiality as far as appropriations or assessments are concerned. I would like time to perfect an amendment so that in this part of the bill we may treat all alike. It has been suggested by my colleague [Mr. MADDEN] that he is opposed to the packers paying overtime. I likewise hold the same position. It is not my desire to give the packers an opportunity to put their hands or fingers on the employees in the inspection of meat, where they might influence the opinion and judgment of these men, but if it is the wish of a majority of the Members of this House to so assess the packers for overtime, why not be fair and assess all the people of this country who are using the time of the veterinarians engaged in this important work. The farmer has a sick cow or a sick horse, and I am told that he calls a veterinarian on a Sunday morning; the veterinarian, perhaps after four or five hours, arrives at the farm, attends to the hog or the cow, and maybe stays until 1 o'clock the following morning.

Mr. LEVER. The argument of the gentleman falls for the reason that the veterinarian is in private practice and not a Government employee.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. I say this, because I am not as familiar with the work of this bureau as the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, and I bow to any suggestion he offers. But I am informed that the veterinarians employed by the Department of Agriculture from time to time are called upon by the farmers to attend their sick cattle. Am I correctly informed that the farmer has the right to call for veterinarians employed by the Bureau of Animal Industry or Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LEVER. That is not my information. I might have to refresh my memory about it.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Let me say that it is the custom, at least out in our country, for any farmer having cholera among his hogs to call up the veterinarian as they would a physician to come and visit his family.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. And he is a Government employee?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. That is for hog cholera, but he is not to practice outside of that.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Of course, I had reference to hog-cholera work.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be correctly informed on that. I have been informed by veterinarians engaged by the bureau that they are called upon by farmers from time to time to attend their herds of cattle or swine or sheep—their sick animals.

Mr. LEVER. I should say that as to their ordinary work as Government employees that may be true, in their hog-cholera work and their tuberculosis work, and things of that kind. That is true, but when they are called upon by some individual to treat a sick animal at night, I imagine they are called upon as individuals and not as Government employees.

Mr. LESHER. The testimony shows that they dare not even do that.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I am reminded by my colleague from Pennsylvania that the testimony shows that they can not even do a private practice.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. I know they are not permitted to engage in private practice.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I know that this is the practice, so far as the veterinarian is concerned, connected with the United States Government station at Purdue University. When the foot-and-mouth disease broke out the veterinarians, with all of their assistants, were busy throughout the State of Indiana until the thing was finally allayed. I know that whenever any new disease breaks out among animals the first report is made to that institution and the veterinarians are sent out from there for that purpose—for the purpose of making investigation and report.

Mr. LEVER. They go as Government employees?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the time has been fixed, but the gentleman is a very modest member of the committee and is

not going to take up much time, so that if this does not set a precedent I shall not object; but it is with the understanding that at the conclusion of his remarks debate upon the paragraph and amendments shall close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, again the chairman of the committee overwhelms me with his kindness. The point that I want to impress upon the minds of the Members of this House is this: I come from the stockyard district. As I have said, I hold no brief for the packers. As we all know, they are now under investigation by a congressional committee. The other day on the streets of Washington I had my first opportunity to meet two of the most prominent men in this industry. That is an illustration of how little I know of the packers personally; yet the packing industry is in my district and I can not refrain from saying that it seems to be the will of some Members of both branches of Congress whenever they desire to break into public print to attack these large industries in the most reckless and unjustifiable manner.

All that I ask for these industries, as a matter of justice, is that they shall receive fair treatment at the hands of the Members of this House.

Again, I know that the farmers of this country have a few friends in this House; at least my observation has convinced me of that fact. Therefore I suggest that if we are going to assess the packers or any other industry for investigational work, or for labor performed by the Department of Agriculture, such assessment should be spread upon all who receive the same benefit, and that means the farmer as well as the packer. If I am misinformed and the farmers do not have the advantage of the services of veterinarians engaged in this work, then we can not ask the farmer to pay for the services; but, gentlemen, I know that the farmer has the benefit of these services, and if you care to hear me I will go into that at greater length.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, if the amendment such as my colleague proposes were embodied in the bill and the farmers were not called upon to use the services of the veterinarian, they would not have to pay, so there could be no harm in it.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I will ask for time to offer this amendment as soon as I can perfect it.

After the fullest investigation and the best consideration I have been able to give this question, I want to say that I am not in favor of either assessing the packer for the overtime of veterinarians, nor am I in favor of assessing the farmer for the services he receives from these governmental employees. I am firmly convinced the Government of the United States has a duty in such matters, and that duty is to pay its own employees in order to retain the fullest control over their actions.

When this question first came up in 1906 President Roosevelt at that time favored payment by the Government for all meat inspection, and he is quoted to this effect in the House hearings of that date on the Chicago stockyards.

I do not believe in any business or industry paying for Government inspection of its own work. Such a practice is wrong in principle, and it would be disastrous in practice. In order to secure undivided allegiance the Government must pay and control its own employees.

With reference to the amendment I propose to introduce, Mr. LEVER has suggested and the Chairman intimates that it is subject to a point of order, and consequently it would be a waste of valuable time for me to attempt to offer same under these circumstances.

Now, I would ask you to bear with me while I discuss the necessity for the increase of pay to the inspectors and veterinarians of the Bureau of Animal Industry.

There are at this time employed by the United States Department of Agriculture approximately 1,700 veterinarians, whose duties are to inspect live stock and to aid live-stock owners and State live-stock sanitary officials in the control and eradication of contagious, infectious, and communicable diseases of animals.

The meat-inspection service, in which bureau veterinarians are employed, consists in the examination of cattle, sheep, swine, and goats from the moment they are received at public stockyards, where they are unloaded from stock cars, through the commission merchants' pens, into the packing houses, where they are slaughtered; thence to the innumerable sections of packing houses, where the meat is prepared in various ways for human consumption. In other words, these servants of the Government inspect and are charged with the responsibility of seeing that only wholesome meat food products enter into commerce for



interstate shipment, as well as meats which are consumed within the States, and other meat products which may be exported.

As testimony of the efficiency of the Government meat-inspection service, not one valid complaint has been sustained against the service since the outbreak of the great world war in 1914, notwithstanding that these products, which have been labeled with the stamp of Government approval, have been sent to every corner of the world. From several sources complaints have been received, and upon investigation have been confirmed, of shipments of meat to Army camps from some small plants where Government inspection is not maintained.

This work was inaugurated many years ago, but the principal meat-inspection act under which the work is now being carried out did not become effective until 1906.

A corps of veterinarians are employed in the control and eradication of diseases of live stock, such as hog cholera, tuberculosis, the eradication of the cattle tick, the eradication of scabies of sheep and cattle, the eradication of glanders from horses and several other maladies which live stock may contract.

Twenty years ago the sheep industry of the United States was rather a precarious one on account of the excessive existence of scabies. At that time there was really no true type of sheep in the United States. Sheep developed much like wolves and coyotes; they multiplied, but without any appreciable upbreeding. It was a case of "survival of the fittest." Oregon sheep were long-legged and thin and could be recognized in contrast with Montana sheep. Texas sheep were different from those raised in California, and the sheep from the plains of New Mexico were unlike those from Utah and Idaho. The disease known as scabies, which is caused by a parasite, not visible to the naked eye and which causes scabs to appear upon the hides and also causes the shedding of the wool, existed in practically every State, and not very much attention was paid to it. It was spreading so rapidly that, if no concerted effort had been made to control it, is it not reasonable to suppose that the industry would have been so seriously handicapped that it would have proved entirely unprofitable?

The United States Department of Agriculture took up the question of the controlling of this disease with State live-stock sanitary officials and the sheep owners, experiments were conducted by treating the sheep with disinfectant to kill the bug which was the cause of the trouble. From those experiments evolved a very practical method of freeing the sheep from the disease by a process of dipping them in a solution of lime and sulphur. Dipping vats were constructed on the sheep ranges and at all of the public stockyards, and whenever a band of sheep were found diseased they were prohibited from being shipped through the country unless they were properly disinfected under supervision. This work developed very rapidly because it proved of vital benefit to the sheep owners.

In the course of 10 or 12 years this disease was practically exterminated, and the quarantine under which many of the States had been placed was removed, thus permitting the free traffic anywhere in the United States. Veterinarians were removed from the work to be placed on work of greater emergency at that time, and in consequence the disease began to spread again, and it became necessary, and, in fact, the sheepmen demanded, that the inspectors be returned to the field to direct the eradication work.

Sheep scabies exists to but a moderate degree in the United States to-day, and out of the hazardous business, which was despised by most live-stock men 20 years ago, there has developed one of the most lucrative and interesting branches of the live-stock industry. There have been developed in the United States true types of sheep. Sheepmen are progressing along definite, well-planned lines, and they are not handicapped now by a disease which, but a few years ago, threatened them with bankruptcy, for it is impossible for sheep to thrive that are affected with scabies and other parasitic diseases.

In 1906 the bureau veterinarians were sent into the Southern States to aid the farmers in the boll-weevil stricken areas in the eradication of the cattle tick. It has been proven beyond peradventure that a profitable cattle industry could not be developed where the cattle tick existed. It has been found by the Bureau of Animal Industry that this parasite, which transmits the organism which causes a fatal disease known as Texas fever, could be eradicated by dipping the cattle which harbored the pest. This work has proven one of the most popular and successful pieces of live-stock sanitary work ever undertaken in any part of the world. More than 70 per cent of the original area quarantined on account of the Texas fever has been freed of the tick, and in the freed counties and States there has been developed, and will continue to be developed, a high class of cattle husbandry. Cattle which in 1906 were valued at about \$10 per head in the tick-infected area are now worth \$40 per head, and

the increased valuation is not entirely due to the high price of cattle everywhere, but these animals are worth more because they are in better condition to be used for beef; that is, while the animals are covered with ticks the parasites suck the blood, and in consequence the host always remains in an unthrifty condition, unsuited for beef purposes. This work will be carried on until there are no cattle ticks left in the United States. This one piece of live-stock sanitation is worth at least \$50,000,000 in the additional beef that the Nation conserves thereby.

Other veterinarians in the Bureau of Animal Industry are engaged in the eradication of hog cholera, a disease which, a few years ago, was cause of an annual loss to the Nation of \$100,000,000. It was discovered by the Bureau of Animal Industry that swine could be immunized against the infection of cholera. This immunization consists of injecting the hogs with a serum obtained from swine which, through treatment, have become highly immunized against the disease. Millions of hogs are treated annually by veterinarians of the bureau, and thereby the losses have been reduced to a very large degree.

Another field in which veterinarians are engaged is in the eradication of tuberculosis. It was absolutely necessary that some agency inaugurate a campaign to check the ravages of this insidious disease. It was spreading from State to State and from herd to herd, as may be judged from the amount of infected animals found in the abattoirs in 1918, where Government inspection was demanded. Out of 35,000,000 swine slaughtered in those establishments, practically 3,500,000 animals were found tubercular to some extent. Likewise with the cattle which were killed, more than 200,000 cattle were found to be infected with tuberculosis in those abattoirs. The owners of live stock from every section of the United States demanded that this work of controlling the eradication of this disease be taken up by the Federal Government. While the campaign has been in existence only a little more than a year, there is sufficient evidence to show that it is making satisfactory progress and is proving to be a very popular work with the farmers.

The Bureau of Animal Industry has in its organization a pathological division, in which veterinarians are engaged in scientific investigations dealing with live-stock diseases. Every year thousands of samples of diseased specimens are forwarded to the bureau, where they are examined microscopically and by animal inoculation, so as to determine the exact nature of the malady.

There are a number of other branches of the live-stock industry to which the veterinarians of the bureau are assigned, such as the supervision of the manufacture by private concerns of hog-cholera serum, virus, and other biological products, such as black-leg vaccine, tetanus antitoxin, tuberculin, mallein, and so forth.

The entrance salary of the veterinarians in the Bureau of Animal Industry is \$1,500 per annum, and, of course, with this parsimonious stipend the bureau is having great difficulty in obtaining the services of professionally trained veterinarians. The future opportunities for veterinarians in the Bureau of Animal Industry is anything but attractive to an earnest, competent, and energetic employee. Of course, the lack of appreciation of the Federal Government for this class of employees has caused hundreds of them to resign every year to take up positions which enable them to support their families and bring them up in a true American way. The average veterinarian in the Bureau of Animal Industry does not receive sufficient compensation to properly feed and clothe the average-sized family.

Many of the best-posted live-stock owners and other persons interested in that industry have grave apprehensions as to how their immense industry is going to be properly protected in the future. Veterinary colleges are closing their doors because young men are not attracted to the profession, simply because there is no opportunity for them to gain a respectable livelihood in it. During the past 12 months four veterinary colleges in the United States terminated their careers. These institutions were known as the George Washington Veterinary College, Washington, D. C., the Kansas City Veterinary College, the San Francisco Veterinary College, and the Terre Haute Veterinary College. It is believed that it will be necessary within the next 12 months for other schools to discontinue.

A veterinarian to-day is a trained man who receives an education of the same completeness as a medical man receives at colleges for physicians. The veterinarian is required to be a high-school graduate, and the course in the veterinary college is fixed at four years of nine months each. Can you imagine a vigorous, intelligent, ambitious high-school graduate being attracted to take up the veterinary profession when the best prospect that he has in sight as an employee of the Federal Government is \$1,500 per annum? Such men will spurn any such proffer for a lifetime career. They need not complete a

high-school course or a grammar-school course to become a butcher, which trade will give them \$60 to \$90 per week, or a puddler in a steel factory, which will pay them \$400 a month, or any other line of industry. The Federal Government, if it does appreciate the services of its employees, should have enough business acumen to see that the efficiency of the whole structure of the Nation will be greatly diminished unless efficiency is recognized and equitable compensations made. Unless the Government is aspiring to inefficiency and failure, it must be willing to at least go part of the way in increasing compensations to its employees as the merchants and manufacturers and every other person, firm, and corporation throughout the length and breadth of the land have done in recognizing the services of the employee.

The veterinarian is the agency upon which the live-stock industry of the Nation, valued at \$10,000,000,000, must place its faith to preserve that gigantic business from the ravages of disease. What would it profit this country to go on building up the cattle, swine, and sheep industry if at the foundation of the industry it was rotten with disease? We are coming to an era now where European countries and South American countries will be seeking for breeding cattle, swine, and sheep. If they come to our land and buy these animals and later they are found to be diseased, our reputation and industry along that line are ruined for all time to come; whereas if we sell them the right kind of live stock free from disease, the Nation will build up a reputation throughout the world that will assure for all time a prosperous industry.

The grade lay inspectors are men who through years of practical experience have gained a wide knowledge of the meat industry. They are men who are qualified to serve the United States Government in the capacity of inspectors or as foremen of various branches of the packing-house industry. A great many of this class of employees have left the Government service to fill positions of more lucrative nature with the meat-packing concerns.

Sometime ago I took up with Secretary Houston and also suggested to his assistant, Mr. Harrison, the imperative need of a substantial increase for the lay inspectors and veterinarians in the Bureau of Animal Industry.

I desire to urge upon you the imperative need of increasing the salaries of these employees. I know something of their work. I know that these men report at their post of duty long before 7 each working day, that they work from 9 to 12 hours, and during the busy season often work both Sundays and holidays.

I know that the veterinarians are responsible for all the work in the enforcement of the regulations pertaining to the meat-inspection laws, that they are directly responsible for all work performed by inspectors under their supervision, and that they are responsible for the enforcement of all the sanitary regulations at the packing houses.

I know that the receipts of animals of recent months have been unprecedented.

I know that many have resigned to take up work in commercial fields where the compensation is considerably greater. This has necessitated a greater responsibility on the older employees. I know that a great number of them have not been advanced for several years; and I also know that by comparing the salaries of the Bureau of Animal Industry employees to packing-house employees, that the employees of the packing industries receive from 50 to 100 per cent more than do the Government employees for equal responsibilities.

Safeguarding the health of the consumer of packing-house products is of greatest importance, and I feel that I am extremely conservative in urging that this be appropriated for the fiscal year 1920.

I want to say something now about the comparison between wages paid by the United States Government and wages paid by private concerns. We know what the veterinarians and inspectors of the Bureau of Animal Industry receive, but take, for instance, the cattle and hog butchers; their weekly wages for weeks ending, respectively, October 12, 19, 26, November 2, 9, 16, and 23, amounted to \$63, \$62, \$60, \$62, \$59, and \$62 each. In addition to wages, many of these men received a bonus amounting in some instances from \$200 to \$300.

The above wage is an average of what is being paid to skilled labor and includes floor men, rumpers, packers, cutters, splitters, hide droppers, and chuck splitters. When you compare their wages with the salary of the Government inspector who has spent the best of his young days in educating and preparing himself for his life's work—namely, the preservation of the health of humanity in the preparation of meat-food products—you will readily see even under normal conditions these inspectors are very unjustly treated.

Let me further submit the following table of wages paid to beef boners for the same weeks suggested heretofore:

Loin rib chuck and plate boners average \$50 to \$100; \$50 to \$105.11; \$50 to \$103; \$37 to \$70; \$47 to \$104; \$50 to \$80; \$50 to \$120.

Common laborers in the beef cutting, who as a class are men composed of uneducated Mexicans and the like, receive weekly wages from \$25 to \$38. The same class of laborers in dry salt curing cellars receive from \$28 to \$40 and in the sweet pickle curing cellars from \$30 to \$45. Foremen and assistant foremen in these departments, whose duties are not more arduous than inspectors and who at all times have advantages for promotion, receive from \$40 to \$65 per week, and it can easily be said that the lay inspectors in educational and executive ability measure up to the standards of these foremen.

The award made by Judge Alschuler in the arbitration between the packers and their employees convinces me that the Government employees are the lowest-paid men in the packing industry, and they are the men that the public holds responsible for the condition of every piece of meat and all meat products that leave the packing house.

I am indebted for some of my information with reference to the Bureau of Animal Industry to Dr. S. J. Walkley and Dr. Hess, who have willingly responded to numerous inquiries made by me.

Let me cite a few reasons why men engaged in the work should receive an increase of salary.

A friend of mine in Chicago—a high-grade gentleman named Richard Walsh—has been in the service of the Bureau of Animal Industry for 24 years and is now receiving \$90 a month. How can he support and educate a family on this salary?

I know another gentleman who associated himself with the Bureau of Animal Industry some twenty years ago. The salary at that time for a young man was attractive—\$60 per month. After being in the service a few years his mother died and left him the family home, worth approximately \$2,000 to \$3,000. Not long afterwards he married, and God blessed him, as he does most of the people of my district, with a large family. Sickness followed; doctor bills and many other incidental expenses accumulated. It finally became necessary for him to mortgage his little home. Unable to keep up the interest the mortgage was finally foreclosed and he had to sacrifice his place of abode.

After 20 years' faithful and efficient service with the Government he is now receiving the enormous salary of \$1,200 a year. I have talked with him a number of times and tried to convince him that he should discontinue his services with the Government and attach his name to some pay roll where his work and efforts would be appreciated, but like many others, after being associated with the Government for a great number of years, he lives in hope the Government will do something substantial for him. These men seem to lose initiative and are fearful because they know nothing but Government work, and fear they may not be able to do as well on the outside.

The gentleman I last spoke of was compelled, on account of the high cost of living, to take his children out of school as they reached the age where State laws would permit them to go to work and send them into factories, thus depriving them of an education so necessary to-day, and practically making impossible an opportunity for them to advance and progress.

Other concrete examples that have been brought to my personal attention:

A gentleman entered the service; lived out in Iowa; owned his own home, worth about \$1,800, with a mortgage of \$600 he had borrowed to improve the property. After he was in the service a year he had to increase the mortgage \$100. The taxes and interest were too much for him, the mortgage was foreclosed in the summer of 1918, and he lost the property. In 1909 he was transferred to another town in Iowa at his own request, figuring that he could do considerably better. He borrowed \$100, which he still owes. After he was in this town for a while it was necessary for him to take his daughter, 16 years of age, out of high school and put her to work. The establishment in Iowa closed down and he was transferred to Chicago. His next oldest daughter was attending high school, but when they came on to Chicago he found expenses so high daughter No. 2 was compelled to leave her studies and start to work. Grocery bills approximated \$55 to \$60, the monthly rent \$35. Of course, cheaper homes, rather more reasonable rates for rent could be had, but this gentleman was anxious to rear his family in a respectable neighborhood. It costs this man about \$120 a month to live. If sickness occurs, doctor and medicine bills accrue, and it is absolutely impossible for him to keep his head above water.



In the case of a man who entered as meat inspector in 1900 at \$1,000. He was 26 years of age when he started. Seven years after his appointment he received an increase of \$200. In order to live it was necessary for him to have his wife find employment. They had three children. His wife had to accept a position with hours from 3 p. m. until 12 o'clock midnight. It was necessary for this gentleman to prepare dinner for himself and the children; also to go about 1 o'clock every morning and meet his wife when she returned from her work.

Another letter from a gentleman who has been a meat inspector for four years. He receives \$1,200 and is unable to meet his obligations. He had to place his household goods in storage and send his wife and three children to be supported through the generosity of relatives.

Another gentleman has been in the Bureau of Animal Industry for 10 years. He now gets \$1,200. He has no children. It takes every dollar he earns to get along. His wife took sick last summer; a doctor's bill resulted, and up to the present time he has been unable to make any payments to the doctor who took care of his wife through her illness.

Another letter from a gentleman who started to work two years ago at a salary of \$840; he is now receiving \$1,080. He has a family of five children. If it were not for the assistance he receives from his parents and the fact that he engages in outside employment several nights a week he would be unable to keep going. Sickness in the family has incurred obligations to the amount of about \$500 in the last two years.

And so on, gentlemen, I could furnish any number of cases such as these from letters I have received; but I do not care to take up your time any longer. The Good Book says, "Feed the hungry and clothe the naked." That suggestion is offered in the spirit of charity. It is not charity that I ask when I request that you take care of the men in this important branch of governmental work; that their families may have an opportunity to receive an education; that they might enjoy some of God's sunshine; that they might have the advantages of a few luxuries; that they get sufficient bread and butter, and occasionally squeeze in a little jam; it is in the spirit of justice I make this request.

Another suggestion: These men suffer many hardships in their line of duty. Working in blood and water in the killing floors, in dry salt and sweet pickle cellars, coolers, and freezers, where temperatures are often 10 degrees below zero. They must be warmly clad for this work, as they are exposed to low and high temperatures which endangers their health. In many cases these men can not afford to buy proper clothing. Boots, shoes, woollens, and leathers have increased over 100 per cent, and the blood, salt, and water conditions wear out the clothing very quickly. Suffering and sickness frequently result on account of their inability to purchase proper clothing. Now, the packers provide men doing this kind of work with suitable clothing, and I think the Government should take this under advisement, and I hope in the near future they will equip men engaged in this capacity with proper raiment that will prevent any ill effects as a result of their work.

Out in Chicago it is often suggested by business men that it is not a question of salary, but a question of getting the right man to fill the job; that they would be willing to pay any price for the right man. If the opportunity is afforded me to meet any who offer this suggestion in the future I am going to refer them to some of the men in the Government service and associated in the Department of Agriculture.

A young man named Harrison, for whom, I am happy to say, a deserved increase was provided, can intelligently and correctly answer more questions than anyone I ever met. Dr. Mohler, connected with this department, a most capable and able gentleman, a master of every detail; Dr. Kiernan, who impresses me as an intellectual giant, and I am advised that he is an authority in his profession. In Chicago, since my election to Congress, I made the acquaintance of a Dr. W. N. Neil, in charge of the Chicago office. All lay inspectors and veterinarians are under his direction; he is interrogated and cross-examined continuously by men engaged by the packers to look after their interests, and the packers pay their representatives from two to three times the salary paid Dr. Neil, who has devoted more than 20 years to the service of the Government. He has won the respect and admiration of all with whom he has come in contact and has received several tempting offers to leave the service. I feel absolutely certain that these gentlemen—and when I speak of them I know this is true of the great majority of men engaged in this bureau, veterinarians and lay inspectors—if they were associated with some large corporation their services would be appreciated, their ability recognized, and their salaries would at least be doubled.

So in conclusion, gentlemen, let me urge upon you the adoption of the amendment I offered in our committee, and while the amount I requested was materially reduced, the sum suggested here, I am pleased to state, is the unanimous report of the committee and it in a small way manifests our appreciation of the great work these men are doing and for the adoption of which I will be thankful and the employees in this department exceedingly grateful.

May I add this poem of T. P. White, an employee of the bureau, which appeared recently. It suggests far more eloquently than I am able to the status of the employees in the Bureau of Animal Industry, commonly referred to as the B. A. I.

#### YE MORTALS WHO WORKED FOR THE B. A. I.

The day of judgment at last had dawned,  
And millions of souls had stretched and yawned;  
Had passed in ranks called by trumpet horn,  
The souls of sinners and babes unborn.  
And amid the few to be glorified  
Were the souls of men not yet "classified."

The Master, He judged, and 'twas done well,  
Sending souls on to heaven or hell,  
With careful thought he reviewed their creeds,  
And the record book for acts and deeds.  
Till he came to a horde of souls most shy  
Of the men who had worked for the B. A. I.

"Recording Angel," the Master said,  
"Why are the souls of these many dead  
So humble in mien, so dreary, so sad?  
Are their records filled with actions bad?"  
"These souls," said the Angel, and heaved a sigh,  
"On earth were employed by the B. A. I."

"Their records are filled with noble deeds;  
They have labored long with many needs;  
Through their mortal lives they have done their share  
To assist mankind, and have dealt fair,  
While they struggled on with wage not high,  
As they worked on earth for the B. A. I."

"In the cities' marts where meats were sold,  
In slaughterhouses, in the heat and cold,  
They applied their skill, under sworn oath bound,  
To the end that food be pure and sound,  
Thus protecting health when danger drew nigh,  
These trusty men of the B. A. I."

"In the field they worked both day and night,  
Preaching the gospel of wrong and right  
To stock raisers and tillers of soil,  
That costly plagues they might learn to foil.  
If failure came, once again they'd try,  
These faithful men of the B. A. I."

A stroke of the pen canceled all debts,  
And He smiled on clerks and "lays" and "vets,"  
Who stood near the throne with gaze steadfast,  
Hoping a "raise" had come at last.  
Then the sentence came, "remain on high,  
Ye mortals who worked for the B. A. I."

And let me add:

That all you Congressmen answer "Aye,"  
And increase the pay of the B. A. I.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman that I would make the point of order against the amendment anyway as not being germane.

Mr. MADDEN. But the gentleman from Illinois might just as well give the gentleman a chance to do something, notwithstanding the point of order which was made against it.

Mr. LEVER. I am ready to receive the gentleman's amendment, but I do not want to stop the reading of the bill until it is prepared.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman ask that the matter be passed over?

Mr. LEVER. No; I would not want to do that. I think it is an unnecessary waste of time, because it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY.

Salaries, Bureau of Plant Industry: One physiologist and pathologist, who shall be chief of bureau, \$5,000; 1 assistant to the chief, \$3,000; 1 executive assistant in seed distribution, \$2,500; 1 officer in charge of publications, \$2,250; 1 landscape gardener, \$1,800; 1 officer in charge of records, \$2,250; 1 executive clerk, \$2,000; 3 executive clerks, at \$1,980 each; 1 seed inspector, \$1,000; 1 seed warehouseman, \$1,400; 1 seed warehouseman, \$1,000; 1 seed warehouseman, \$840; 9 clerks, class 4; 14 clerks, class 3; 4 clerks, at \$1,500 each; 25 clerks, class 2; 3 clerks, at \$1,320 each; 73 clerks, class 1; 2 clerks or draftsmen, at \$1,200 each; 2 clerks, at \$1,100 each; 4 clerks, at \$1,080 each; 7 clerks, at \$1,020 each; 30 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 43 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 clerk or draftsman, \$900; 11 clerks, at \$840 each; 1 laborer, \$780; 42 messengers or laborers, at \$720 each; 8 messengers or laborers, at \$660 each; 16 messengers or laborers, at \$600 each; 1 artist, \$1,620; 1 artist, \$900; 1 clerk or artist, \$1,400; 2 clerks or artists, at \$1,200 each; 1 photographer, \$1,200; one photographer, \$840; 2 laboratory

alds, at \$1,440 each; 1 laboratory aid, \$1,380; 4 laboratory aids or clerks, at \$1,200 each; 1 laboratory aid, clerk, or skilled laborer, \$1,080; 3 laboratory aids, clerks, or skilled laborers, at \$1,020 each; 2 laboratory aids, at \$960 each; 1 laboratory aid, \$900; 4 laboratory aids, at \$840 each; 7 laboratory aids, at \$720 each; 1 laboratory apprentice, \$720; 1 map tracer or laboratory aid, \$900; 2 gardeners, at \$1,440 each; 4 gardeners, at \$1,200 each; 8 gardeners, at \$1,100 each; 15 gardeners, at \$900 each; 19 gardeners, at \$780 each; 1 skilled laborer, \$1,100; 1 skilled laborer, \$960; 2 skilled laborers, at \$900 each; 3 skilled laborers, at \$840 each; 1 assistant in technology, \$1,400; 1 assistant in technology, \$1,380; 1 mechanic, \$1,080; 1 mechanical assistant, \$1,200; 1 blacksmith, \$1,200; 1 carpenter, \$900; 1 painter, \$900; 1 teamster, \$840; 1 teamster, \$600; 21 laborers, at \$540 each; 29 messengers or laborers, at \$480 each; 3 messenger boys, at \$660 each; 14 messenger boys, at \$600 each; 10 messenger boys, at \$480 each; 5 messenger boys, at \$420 each; 16 messenger boys, at \$360 each; 4 charwomen, at \$480 each; 21 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$491,280.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I hesitate to take the time of the committee on anything, but we are making very good progress on this bill. I would ask the gentleman from South Carolina, or any other gentlemen a member of the Committee on Agriculture, if he knows anything about this new order issued forbidding the importation of nursery stock into the United States after June 1 next?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that if he will permit me to get it from my office I shall be very glad to give him a very full statement of the matter. It came to my office this morning, I think, but I have not yet had time to read it. It is not involved here. The Secretary sent me a very full statement about it.

Mr. MANN. I am very much obliged to the gentleman, because I intended to go over to the Horticultural Board and ascertain, as the country is very anxious to know, whether this order is to stand or not. No one defends the form of it, except to say it may be the best they can do. It allows the introduction of a seedling tree and forbids the introduction of a grafted tree, it allows the introduction of a tulip bulb and forbids the introduction of a peony root, and it affects a great many nurserymen and florists throughout the United States disastrously. Now, I do not undertake to say whether the order is justified or not, but somebody ought to be prepared to say they are certain that it is justifiable; and, gentlemen, there will be a roar going up in this country against this order when it takes effect such as we have not heard even about the hog cholera or tuberculosis in cattle, which swept the House off its feet.

Mr. LEVER. As a matter of fact, the roar has already come, as would be seen if the gentleman could see some of the letters I have received.

Mr. MANN. I know the roar has come, but the roar really has not commenced yet, as the order has not taken effect and they can still import until June 1. Now, it is going to be utterly unfair to the business interests involved if they start this thing and then stop it because somebody protests. It may ruin many a man, and the department ought to be very certain of its ground both as to its desirability and its legality and its power to withstand the roar that will come up from Members of Congress.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNER. Under what authority is this order issued?

Mr. MANN. I think very likely they have the authority. We have an insecticide law not only prohibiting the importation from foreign countries but prohibiting the transportation of anything from an oak tree to an acorn or a smaller seed from one county to another or from one State to another.

Mr. TOWNER. But for some particular purpose; I was wondering what the particular purpose was that would be assigned in this case.

Mr. MANN. The purpose in this case is not protection of home industries but to prevent the introduction of insects or disease in plants.

Mr. TOWNER. I was going to ask the gentleman in that connection if a wholesale order of this kind could be justified for such a purpose. That was the thought I had in my mind.

Mr. MANN. Of course, the order as it is framed started out with the idea, I think, that it would prohibit the importation of any plants that had any dirt upon them, on the idea that the diseases might be in the dirt, although we permit the introduction of a great many plants, the roots of which are taken right out of the dirt in the native soil. But what I wanted to get at also, if the gentleman's letter covers it, is whether any method is provided by which importations can be made through the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LEVER. These prohibited plants?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. I have not read this communication, but I will ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD so we may have it at this point. It is a memorandum prepared by the department.

Mr. MANN. Is it a printed memorandum?

Mr. LEVER. No; it is merely a memorandum, one just sent up.

Mr. MANN. I would like to get it before it goes in the RECORD—

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent to insert it at this point.

Mr. MANN. Because I hate to destroy my eyes by reading the small type in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting the matter indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
FEDERAL HORTICULTURAL BOARD,  
Washington, D. C.

MEMORANDUM OF INFORMATION CONCERNING QUARANTINE No. 37, RESTRICTING THE IMPORTATION OF NURSERY STOCK AND OTHER PLANTS AND SEEDS ON AND AFTER JUNE 1, 1919.

A HISTORY OF THE ACTUAL STEPS LEADING UP TO THE ISSUANCE OF THE QUARANTINE.

The need for additional restrictions on the importation of nursery stock and other plants and seeds has been under careful consideration by the board for several years. This need has been emphasized by numerous requests for greater restrictions on plant importations from official bodies representing the State departments of agriculture, the inspection officials of the States, entomological and phytopathological associations, forestry, horticultural, and other associations, etc. As a basis for such additional restrictions, a public hearing was conducted at this department May 28, 1918, and the proposed restrictions were thoroughly discussed with all the interests involved, including, in addition to the above, both importing nurserymen and seedsmen as well as producing nurserymen in this country.

Following this hearing, and at the request of the board, the subject was given careful study in all of its phases by the plant experts of the Department of Agriculture over a period of several months, in the course of which many of the principal nursery and florist establishments of the United States were visited by these experts, and the details of the proposed quarantine were discussed with the persons in charge of these establishments. As a result of this extended inquiry, a tentative draft of proposed regulations was formulated and submitted to the principal nurserymen of the country. A final conference was then held in the office of the chairman of the board October 18, 1918, at which all interested parties were invited to submit criticisms or suggestions either in person or by letter. The quarantine and regulations as finally adopted represent the best judgment of the plant experts of this department after a thorough reconsideration of the entire subject.

In formulating the quarantine and regulations the idea that has been kept constantly in mind is to reduce the danger of introducing injurious insects and plant diseases to the minimum with the least possible disturbance to the interests involved. The classes of nursery stock and other plants and seeds, the commercial entry of which is to be continued, are those represented by importers and other trade interests as being most essential to the horticulture and floriculture of this country under existing conditions.

DISCUSSION OF PRINCIPAL OBJECTIONS IN LETTERS OF PROTEST AGAINST THE QUARANTINE.

Recently numerous letters have reached the department protesting against the enforcement of the quarantine. Practically all of these letters are in response to a printed circular entitled "Protest against the horticultural import prohibition," signed by Henry A. Dreer, of Philadelphia, and sent to nurserymen all over the country. Most of the letters received simply repeat the information contained in Mr. Dreer's circular letter.

In that letter reference is made to what is considered inconsistencies in the regulations in that they permit the entry of rose stocks for propagation and of six varieties of bulbs, while they exclude budded or grafted roses and all bulbs with the exception of the six varieties referred to.

During the period when the quarantine was under discussion the Federal Horticultural Board was urged very strongly by many advisers, including horticultural and forestry associations and State plant inspectors and their organizations, to prohibit entirely the importation of all plants, bulbs, and other classes of nursery stock on the ground that all of them were sources of risk of introducing dangerous insects and plant diseases.

Such dangers do exist. They are greatest in importations from distant or little-known countries, many of which do not maintain any system of inspection. The dangers are proportionally greater among the miscellaneous classes of nursery stock and other plants, including bulbs, which are imported in smaller quantities, but which represent numerous genera and species and bring in a corresponding number of new parasites.

While complete exclusion undoubtedly affords the greatest measure of safety, the governing principle in the quarantine as issued was to limit plant introductions to the classes of plants which were represented by the plant interests concerned in this country as being essential to plant production; in other words, the raw material out of which salable fruit trees, roses, etc., are made. To this were added certain classes of plants, including bulbs and seeds, which could be safeguarded by inspection and disinfection. In the case of bulbs it was realized that a danger existed, and the entry was restricted to classes of bulbs least subject to risk of bringing in new pests and which from their nature could be most readily inspected and certified as clean and, for the most part, originating in countries where the least risk of danger attaches. The excluded bulbs involve the less important and miscellaneous importations coming from widely scattered sources over the world, and the entry of which is attended with much greater risk of introduction of plant diseases or insect pests.



The quarantine makes provision for the entry of these miscellaneous other bulbs and other prohibited articles in limited quantities through the office of foreign seed and plant introduction, this department, for the purpose of keeping the country supplied with new varieties and creations and the necessary breeding or propagating stock, such entry necessarily being safeguarded by the highly developed inspection and quarantine service which has been organized by this department. It is impracticable to give this type of inspection to commercial importations. The cost would be prohibitive, especially under conditions which would require very frequent provision for holding the imported material in quarantine for a period of months or years and the necessity for very high-grade and expert inspectors. Furthermore, inspectors with the training required are not available.

The distinction between rose stocks, on the one hand, and budded or grafted roses on the other, was made with a view to accomplishing two objects: (1) To reduce the number of roses imported, thus reducing the risk involved, and (2) to limit importations largely to such stock as is usually grown in commercial nurseries where special care is exercised to control and eradicate pests. The stocks permitted entry under item 3 of regulation 3 are practically always grown in commercial nurseries, while budded and grafted roses may, immediately upon their arrival in the United States, be shipped broadcast over the country to consumers who pay little or no attention to the eradication of any insects or diseases the plants may carry.

Mr. Dreer's letter also conveys the impression that at the hearing and conference the information given the board was against the advisability of putting the quarantine into effect. On the contrary, at the hearing, which was largely attended and of which a stenographic record was kept, the argument was strongly in favor of the quarantine, and, as indicated in the early part of this statement, the restrictions which have been embodied in this quarantine have been strongly urged and indorsed by many representatives of the nursery trade and unanimously by letters received from officials representing the forest, agricultural, and horticultural interests of the several States.

The argument that this action is unjust to European countries, particularly at this time when they are just released from the restrictions on commerce caused by the war, has its force and is emphasized by the keen sympathy which we all feel, especially for Belgium and France. If, however, there are important dangers to be guarded against and therefore a real need for these restrictions, mere sentiment, however strongly warranted, has no place. In point of fact, with respect to the two countries which have suffered most from the war—France and Belgium—the latter is the only one which is much affected by this quarantine. The plant exports of France are largely fruit-tree stocks, which are still permitted entry. Unfortunately the plant exports of Belgium are largely ornamentals, shipped with earth about the roots, and are therefore the ones which entail greatest risk to the United States; and, furthermore, the inspection service of Belgium is inferior to that of both France and Holland. In the case of Holland the argument from the war standpoint does not apply to the same extent, and, furthermore, the bulb exports of Holland are not materially interfered with. The potted and baled plants, however, from Holland convey the same dangers that they would from Belgium and other foreign countries.

In general, with respect to this action and to European countries, it should be remembered that this quarantine merely places the United States in more close alignment with action long since taken by these countries relative to plant imports from the United States. France, Holland, Germany, and to a less extent Belgium, have long maintained practically complete prohibition of plant imports from the United States.

#### DISCUSSION OF THE CONDITIONS WHICH HAVE RENDERED SUCH QUARANTINE RESTRICTIONS NECESSARY.

With respect to the actual condition of nursery stock and other plants hitherto received from foreign countries, it is appreciated that the countries which have been most concerned in such exports to the United States have established inspection and certification service, with the result of very greatly reducing the amount of infestation on such exported plants. The conditions in this respect prior to the passage of the plant-quarantine act and the requirement of inspection and certification on the part of foreign countries, and the rigorous holding of these countries up to as high a standard as possible, were deplorable. Brown-tail moth nests and gipsy-moth egg masses and numerous other insect pests in various stages were coming into the United States in quantity, and in one season thousands of such brown-tail moth nests were found in nursery stock, particularly from Holland, Belgium, and France.

The improvement since the establishment of this service, as indicated, has been very great, but it has not by any means eliminated the danger. Of these principal export countries Holland has perhaps as good an inspection service as any, if not the best. The service of France is nearly as good as that of Holland. The service of Belgium is inferior, and the risk from other countries is even greater.

The status as to freedom from insects and diseases of plant imports from Holland probably represents, therefore, the best work that can be expected under existing conditions of inspection and certification. Notwithstanding the supreme effort of the Netherlands Government to safeguard its plant exportations to the United States, a great many injurious insects have been found on stock imported from that country since August, 1912, when the Federal plant-quarantine act became effective. During this period of six years of enforcement of this act and inspection of imported plant materials no less than 148 different species of injurious insects have been collected on nursery stock imported from Holland. Some of these have been found in over 1,100 different shipments of plants. Many have been detected hundreds of times. It is true that many of these are insects which have already become established in the United States, but many others are insects which have not been so established and which are new elements of danger to the horticulture and agriculture of this country. For example, the European tussock moth (*Notolophus antiqua*) has been found in connection with no less than 67 different shipments of plants from Holland, representing over 16 different kinds of ornamental plants. Similarly, many other injurious leaf-feeding and wood-boring insects have been collected on from one to many different shipments of plants.

This list of 148 different kinds of insects on Holland stock includes comparatively few of the soil-infesting species, because it has not been possible without destruction of the plants to disintegrate and make adequate examination of the soil imported with baled and potted plants. The danger is probably much greater from such insects concealed in the soil than it is from the insects which are found on the aerial portion of the plants. Dr. T. J. Headlee, New Jersey State entomologist, reported at the hearing conducted by this department in May, 1918, on the subject of this quarantine, that his office two years before had

made a limited study of the insect fauna in baled plants from Europe, and a short examination of perhaps two dozen baled plants had resulted in the finding of over 20 different species of insects in the soil.

There is risk of entry from foreign countries through the medium of such soil of a vast number of insects, many of which may have no relation to the plants imported but are possibly important enemies of field crops, such as clover, alfalfa, and other forage crops and the grains. For example, there are more than a score of European weevils and root borers known to infest clover, alfalfa, and related plants. Several of these have already been introduced into this country and are now among our most serious forage insect pests. Examples of these are the alfalfa weevil now invading half a dozen States surrounding Utah, its point of introduction, and the clover-leaf weevil now widely distributed throughout the United States. Of the same nature are many insects likely to be brought in with soil which affect common truck crops. Several of these have already been introduced with plants imported with soil, such as the European mole cricket, the European earwig, and various wireworms. The list of such European truck-crop insects possible of introduction with soil is a very long one. There are also many important European fruit insects which can be introduced with soil about the roots of nursery stock. These include apple, pear, and plum weevils, fruit and bud weevils, twig and stem borers, and various leaf-feeding insects which hibernate in the soil.

With respect to plant material which it is necessary to bring in with the soil, it should be borne in mind also that no system of effective disinfection of the soil about such plants without destroying the plants is known.

The risk from importations from Oriental countries, such as China and Japan, and other quarters of the world where the insect enemies and diseases of plants have been very meagerly studied, is illustrated by the establishment in this country from such sources of many of our most important injurious insect pests and plant diseases. Few of these were known prior to their appearance in this country, and therefore could not specifically have been looked out for and guarded against. Among such introduced insects are the San Jose scale, the citrus white fly, the oriental peach moth, and the Japanese beetle. The peach moth and the Japanese beetle, furthermore, illustrate insects which it is apparently impossible to kill by any practicable fumigation in their hibernating condition.

The list of insects introduced from such little-explored countries is already very large, and the new pests constantly being intercepted on such stock now coming in represent a constant and very serious menace to this country. A recent illustration of this state of affairs came in last month's report of Mr. E. M. Ehrhorn, a collaborator of the board and chief of the division of plant inspection of the Board of Commissioners of Agriculture and Forestry of Hawaii. Mr. Ehrhorn reports that in December, 1918, he made a thorough examination of two small pots of a dwarf Chinese arbor vitae (*Thuja orientalis*) offered for entry at Honolulu and took from the soil about the roots of these plants no less than 122 grubs of a curculionid beetle, a near relative of such injurious insects as the alfalfa weevil, plum and apple curculio, etc.

The danger of introducing plant diseases is just as great if not greater than that of introducing new insect pests, and with respect to such diseases inspection is a safeguard of no importance. Very often these diseases are not discoverable by inspection, or may develop to a visible stage only after a period of months or years after the plants have been imported. Notable examples of such diseases received from the Orient are the chestnut blight and citrus canker from Japan and China. With respect to the risk of introduction of dangerous diseases from Europe, it is significant that of the three serious forest diseases that have been imported into this country in recent years, two of them, the white-pine blister rust and the European poplar canker, have come from Europe, where both these diseases are well known, and in spite of the protection of the European inspection service.

A manual describing the dangerous insects likely to be introduced into the United States has recently been published by the Department of Agriculture. It was designed for the information of Federal and State inspectors, and lists and describes over 3,000 distinct insect pests. Probably half of these are Old World insects injurious to forest and shade trees, and the balance insects injurious to fruit and ornamental trees and to the various farm and garden crops. A similar manual is in preparation on the fungous diseases on plants likely to be introduced into the United States.

#### LOSSES OCCASIONED BY INTRODUCED PESTS.

In this discussion the actual losses now being suffered from plant enemies, insects and disease, which have been introduced from foreign sources have not been considered. These losses, occasioned by insect pests to agriculture in this country, have been carefully worked out by experts to cover both the actual damage of these pests to the crops concerned and also the cost of the control operations. This is not the place for an extended discussion, but a few illustrations may be given.

Typical examples of insect pests introduced with nursery stock or other plant material are the San Jose scale, the oriental peach moth, and the Japanese beetle. The San Jose scale has been in this country for certainly 40 and perhaps 50 years. It became widespread throughout the United States in the late nineties, and at the present time there is practically not a commercial deciduous orchard in the United States that it is not necessary to spray at least once annually to control this pest. The expenditures for apparatus and spraying alone in the United States amount to approximately \$10,000,000 annually. In addition to this are the losses which the insect causes in spite of this control treatment, and they are very large, especially in small orchards and household plantings, where spraying is not always practiced. This insect alone undoubtedly has cost this country during these years upward of \$100,000,000.

The oriental peach moth, which gained entry in 1912 with imported ornamental cherry trees from Japan, has just begun its spread and depredations. It affects practically all deciduous fruits, and bids fair to be a much more destructive pest in the long run than the San Jose scale.

The Japanese beetle, brought in about the same time as the peach moth, has already obtained such firm foothold that in view of its habits and powers of prolonged flight it is probably incapable of extermination, and will no doubt ultimately overspread the United States. It attacks not only practically all fruits but also many garden vegetables and corn. The amount of damage which it will ultimately cause to American agriculture is undoubtedly tremendous. It is worthy of note that this beetle, in the opinion of the experts of this department and of the State of New Jersey who have investigated the matter, was brought in by the Dreer Nursery with importations of liris from Japan. The insect first appeared in the heart of the Dreer Nurseries, and has



spread from this center over an area of approximately 25,000 acres, involving four townships in New Jersey, opposite Philadelphia.

The annual cost to this country of the San Jose scale and the probable ultimate annual cost of these other two recently introduced oriental pests, would probably pay for the total importations since the foundation of this Republic of ornamental nursery, and florist stock. The declared value of the importation of such stock for the year 1914 was only \$3,606,808. It should be understood that the plant stocks still permitted entry represent much of this value.

These insects are mere examples of a vast horde of introduced insect pests. Upward of 100 different imported injurious insects to agriculture and forestry have been thus introduced, and in addition to these, hundreds of other minor insect pests. The total annual loss occasioned by these introduced insect pests to our national forest and farm crops, etc., from careful estimates which have been made, very much exceeds a million dollars a day—in other words, approximately \$500,000,000 a year.

It is true that many of these foreign insect pests have come in independently of nursery stock, as, for example, the Hessian fly, the pink bollworm of cotton, and European corn borer. Nevertheless, the bulk of the introductions have been with living plant material of all sorts.

Losses correspondingly large are chargeable to introduced plant diseases. Nursery stock and other plant importations are responsible for such important diseases as the chestnut blight, which has already destroyed the chestnut forests over much of eastern United States, and threatens the existence of the entire chestnut growth of the country, the white-pine blister rust, a disease already widespread in the eastern white-pine area, and the citrus canker recently introduced from Japan and Asia and threatening the very existence of much of the American citrus development of Florida and the Gulf coast. The attempt in Florida and elsewhere in the United States to eliminate this disease has necessitated the burning of nurseries and hundreds of established orchards. Giant oil torches have been devised which will lick up and utterly consume large fruiting trees in a few minutes, and the entire orchards in a few days. This, of course, means the destruction of property which represents thousands of dollars of expenditure and years of labor. Furthermore, Congress has appropriated and is still appropriating considerable sums to aid in the control of these pests.

#### INADEQUACY OF SPECIAL QUARANTINES.

To prevent the entry of like plant pests quarantines and restrictions have been applied under the plant quarantine act to all important dangers as they appear, and in this piecemeal fashion some 20 restrictive orders or quarantines are now in force against foreign plants and plant products. Such piecemeal action can only be taken, however, when the enemy is known, and gives no security against such unknown or unanticipated enemies as the San Jose scale, the oriental peach moth, and the alfalfa weevil.

#### NECESSITY OF GENERAL QUARANTINE.

It certainly would seem to be good business and practical common sense to stop as far as possible such dangerous introductions to the agriculture and horticulture of this country. This is the primary object of the action taken in quarantine No. 37. The experts of this department are convinced that it will be possible very promptly for the producers of this country to supply practically all the needs for plants prohibited by this quarantine, and this opinion has been indorsed by leading nurserymen and florists.

After having studied this subject for many years, and after giving earnest consideration and practical trial to the possible alternatives of inspection and disinfection of plant imports, the department and the country at large have reached the conclusion that the only possible solution of this problem, which is constantly becoming more serious with the widening of commerce, is in the policy of practical exclusion of all stock not absolutely essential to the horticultural and floricultural needs of the United States. The conclusion is absolutely a forced one that no other system will give adequate protection to the great fruit and agricultural interests of the country, and these interests are so paramount as to fully warrant the restriction prescribed at this time in quarantine No. 37.

The main lines of this quarantine are undoubtedly justified, but it is entirely proper at any time for the interests affected to make any suggestion of modification which may appeal to such interests as being warranted to meet essential needs and which can be granted without opening up dangers which quarantine No. 37 is designed to guard against. Correspondingly, should it develop that the entry of any of the plants or classes of plants now permitted should be accompanied with dangers which can not be otherwise safeguarded, on such showing the restrictions must necessarily be extended to cover such plants. In this connection the department now has prepared an amendment to regulation 3, permitting the use of sand, soil, or earth in packing the bulbs specified in item No. 1 of that regulation, when such sand, soil, or earth has been previously sterilized in accordance with methods prescribed by the Federal Horticultural Board.

C. L. MALATT,  
Chairman of Board.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn.  
The Clerk read as follows:

For conducting such investigations of the nature and means of communication of the disease of citrus trees, known as citrus canker, and for applying such methods of eradication or control of the disease as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture may be necessary, including the payment of such expenses and the employment of such persons and means, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and cooperation with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations of growers, or individuals, as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purposes, \$196,320, and, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, no expenditures shall be made for these purposes until a sum or sums at least equal to such expenditures shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by State, county, or local authorities, or by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of such purposes: *Provided*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do so to obtain information from the committee as to the condition of the citrus canker and its ravages throughout the South. As I recall, a year ago when this item was under consideration the gentleman stated that this pest was under control and it would be but a short time when there would be no further need of this appropriation.

Mr. LEVER. In a measure that is very true. The citrus canker has been largely eliminated from Florida and a number of the other Southern States. They have, however, a rather serious outbreak in the Rio Grande Valley in Texas. The work being done now in Florida and other States is largely a matter of investigating and inspecting certain nursery stock to see if there is any left. It will take a few years before the work is complete. Dr. Kellerman, testifying before the committee, stated that two years would probably complete this work.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of this \$196,000 appropriation how much is contemplated to be used in Florida and the adjoining States, where the pest was most virulent a few years ago?

Mr. LEVER. My recollection is that it is a very small percentage.

Mr. STAFFORD. So that the greater percentage of this appropriation is to be placed for emergency use in the Rio Grande Valley?

Mr. LEVER. In real eradication work.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman will observe there is a decrease of \$50,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

For soil-bacteriology and plant-nutrition investigations, including the testing of samples, procured in the open market, of cultures for inoculating legumes, and if any such samples are found to be impure, nonviable, or misbranded, the results of the tests may be published, together with the names of the manufacturers and of the persons by whom the cultures were offered for sale, \$39,000.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, the civilized world has just passed the supreme crisis in its history. Civilization and its right to exist has been put to its bitterest test. War has been waged between two antagonistic and irreconcilable systems of government—on the one hand a government of brute force administered by the few, and on the other government by designated representatives of the masses. Out of this clash of contending systems may we hope that lasting good to all the world may flow.

In this great conflict in which right and justice contended successfully and victoriously against all the minions of autocracy and infamy the United States played no small part. A more magnificent army of brave and sturdy young men never went to battle with a sublimer courage nor in a juster cause. All honor to them for the part they have played. Nothing that we can do will be too good for them when they return nor in the years that are to follow. Nothing that we can do for them will be more gladly received by them nor do them and their posterity as much and lasting good as to preserve for them the best government ever devised by statesmen.

These intrepid young men went forth to fight for this Government and its rights, not for some other form of government or its rights. They went forward with zeal and glee to fight for this Republic and its great institutions. We should make it our highest hope and our first ambition to preserve for them when they return a representative Republic and not a conglomerate mass of socialism and all the other isms.

The great work of this war has been finished, and let us hope that in finishing this task we have put war so far in the future that none now living will ever again be called from the wonderful arts of peace by the dreaded note of martial music.

With this task now completed, we turn to the tragic days of reconstruction. I say "tragic" because I think they are the most momentous days that this Republic has faced since the curtain rose on American history. The coming months are freighted with more opportunity for evil than any ever faced, not excepting those following the great War between the States, when so many foolish and unnecessary things were done by people in the atmosphere of passion and prejudice.

I fear that the trend of the times is a sinister portent for the preservation of the Government that our soldiers fought to continue. Instead of the established way of curing evils that grow up in industry, by legislating to correct those evils, from many quarters the only suggestion that comes is for the Government to take over, own, and operate the industry—and every time some sick and tottering makeshift of an industry gets into the deep waters of real affairs it comes running to the Government, crying "Take me ere I perish."

When the Federal Trade Commission had a short time ago conducted an investigation into the packing industry of the country and found that evils existed—and I do not doubt there are many that should be corrected—they did not come to Congress with a recommendation of a program of legislation to correct these evils and divorce the packing industry from some of the many lines they have taken up, which the commission reports is not just and right to the public, but they came with a single recommendation that the Government take over and operate the allied lines of the packing industry.



Then comes the assertion that the telephones and telegraphs are not performing the functions for which they were intended and that evils have grown up in their operation, which I believe is correct. Does a recommendation come from the Postmaster General, who now has charge of the telegraphs and telephones under the war power, of a program of legislation to correct these evils and force the telegraphs and telephones to well serve the people and the Government? No; but the single recommendation that the Government take over, own, and operate the telegraph and telephone lines. What do we find in connection with the telegraph and telephone lines? Complaint from every portion of this land comes of the poorer service and a higher rate. I want to say that I am in favor of restoring the telegraphs and telephones to private control, under Government regulation, at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. Chairman, the greatest problem that we face to-day is the railroad question. The question is, Shall we keep the railroads or with proper legislation turn them back to private control? I am not now nor have I ever been in favor of Government ownership of railroads, and nothing that has happened in the recent past in Government operation has caused me to lessen my opposition to Government ownership of railroads, but has intensified that opposition. I here and now make the broad assertion and defy successful contradiction that Government ownership in practical results has been a dismal failure the world over. Everywhere it has brought higher rates, more unsatisfactory service, and a lower wage to labor. I am within the facts when I say that every country in Europe except England has now or has had in the past some form of Government ownership of railroads, and I am further within the facts when I say that statistics show beyond a doubt that in the whole of Europe it costs as much to haul a ton of freight 1 mile as it does to haul a ton of freight 2 miles in the United States, with a poorer and more unsatisfactory service, both for freight and passengers.

Take Prussia, where Government ownership is at its best, where it is operated under the best conditions anywhere in the world, the haul on the same commodity is just about twice as much as it is in the United States. These conditions exist in Europe, where the railroads are standardized, and where the country is fully developed—where all the railroads that are needed or wanted have already been built and are in operation. How much more burdensome and expensive would Government ownership be in a country like ours, where so much of our country is practically undeveloped, and where people are crying for the expenditure of enormous sums to extend existing lines and to build new roads that are necessary for the development of virgin territory? How much higher would freight and passenger fares mount here, when the Government can not now run the roads without an enormous deficit, even though the rates have been increased to an unheard-of extent? Private initiative and the hope of ultimate profits only will cause the hazard of new roads into new and undeveloped territory. Individuals always operate industry more economically than government.

What magic has been wrought anywhere at any time with Government ownership of anything that would cause this wild shriek of the centralizationist in favor of plunging this country into this maze of destruction to the fundamental principles of this Republic? I make the assertion here and now that under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution the Government has all the regulatory power over the instrumentalities of interstate transportation that it would have under Government ownership. If the Government should encumber itself with the ownership and operation of all the railroads, it would involve itself in political confusion and corruption unspeakable, which alone would offset any possible advantage suggested by the disordered mind of the wildest theorist. Government ownership has been the football of politics everywhere. The man who thinks for a moment that Government ownership and operation will take the railroads out of politics is indeed a shortsighted man. If we had Government ownership of railroads there would be more political logrolling by Members of Congress and influential organizations to get new roads built, existing lines extended, and ornate depots built in ambitious towns than there has ever been with the rivers and harbors or with public buildings, with all the reported stench of "pork barrel."

Gentlemen talk of Government ownership lightly and seem to think that it would be an easy transition from private ownership and control to Government ownership and operation. They seem to forget that at one fell swoop they would add more than \$20,000,000,000 to our national debt. On December 13, 1916, the latest date for which the Interstate Commerce Commission has complete figures, the total outstanding capitalization of all the railroads in the United States amounted to \$20,679,350,501, of which \$8,958,815,801 was stock and \$11,720,534,

690 was bonds. There are in the United States to-day 503,833 stockholders, and the Interstate Commerce Commission reports that they do not have a definite number of bondholders, but there are probably as many bondholders as stockholders.

Do you think that it is a small question when we start out to try to deal with these billions worth of property and with a million stock and bond holders of this country? It matters not whether the stock and bonds which they hold represent value or not, at least all the small stock and bond holders have paid value for their holdings. You would also by this one stroke add 2,000,000 employees to the Government, which would again add to the politics of the situation. The politicians would at that time be torn between two contending factions—the public on the one hand demanding better service and a lower rate, with 2,000,000 employees on the other hand demanding increased wages. I believe that every laboring man should have a wage that is a living wage, provided he earns it. I think that wages in many lines, and especially in the railroad service, have been too low in the past; some of them have probably been high enough. It is not because I want to defeat the ends of labor, whereby a man may receive a wage that he can support himself and his family decently, that I oppose Government ownership of railroads, but I believe that a great many employees of the railroad companies have been misled into supporting Government ownership of railroads on the one ground only, and that is that under the recent Government operation they have received a higher wage than they did in the past. Does labor want to go on under a system where merit commands promotion and where the humblest man may aspire to the highest place in the service, or does he want the good jobs to be handed around as political plums to some one because he supported some particular man or some political party?

In the United States under private control, even before the recent increase in wages to the employees, the employees of railroads received the best wages and had the best hours of labor of any class of railway employees on earth; but with the Government owning the railroads, with 2,000,000 men on one side demanding higher pay, with the other millions of Americans on the other side demanding better and cheaper service—does the railroad employee believe that he would be able to command higher wages when the organized taxpayers of the country felt the tremendous burden of increased rates that always goes with Government ownership and operation of railroads?

Talk of taking railroads out of politics by Government ownership! Gentlemen have only to refer to the history of countries that have tried it. In some of the countries that have Government ownership of railroads the politics of the situation has become so bad that every person high or low employed by a railroad has been denied the right to vote for any member of the legislative branch of the government. It would build up here at Washington a bureau government the like of which has never been seen in the world, and no one who has read history, with any degree of understanding will deny that a government by bureau is the worst and meanest autocracy upon the earth.

Ah, gentlemen, shall we send forth our gallant young men to fight and die to destroy autocracy and tyranny in a foreign land, and at the same time allow to be built up in our own land another kind of autocracy? In this hour of reconstruction and hysteria we had better go slow in throwing off the tried and tested and taking on the new and untried. Every consideration of the public welfare, it seems to me, argues against government going into any more business than it is now in. It is the province of government to govern business where there is need, not go into business. If the American people are ready for higher taxes, higher, more expensive, and more unsatisfactory service, they are ready for full Government ownership and operation of industry.

If the cotton farmers of the South want higher rates on cotton shipments, which will be taken from the price of cotton, and hence a lower price, they are ready for Government ownership of railroads. If they want a system under which the service will be poorer, as is the case in all countries that have had Government ownership and operation, then they are ready for Government ownership. I do not believe they are ready for this or want it.

Everyone knows who is not blind to the facts that we have race feeling in some sections of the country, where whites and blacks are not now and never will be on an equal social plane. Do the people of these sections want the separate coach law abolished and whites and blacks made to ride in the same cars? I tell you frankly, this is what will happen, as Congress will never pass a law nor uphold one forcing whites and blacks to ride in separate coaches. This matter alone would add fire and action to this question that we are all seeking to keep from flaming into destruction.

Is it possible that government is so impotent that it can not deal in a legislative way with the great problems of industry, or will the statesmen of this hour acknowledge their inability to cope with the situation and surrender to this form of bureau autocracy that is against the genius of our Republic and its institutions and which will, if adopted, ultimately destroy our form of government?

Government ownership of railroads would destroy every sort of competition in facilities and service, and no one who knows the situation will argue but that the conveniences to the public in travel are brought about by the competition in service and facilities.

Under private ownership we have built up the greatest and most efficient and extensive railroad system in the world. In America we have, by the latest official report, 252,029 miles of railroad. The next country approaching this in number of miles of railroad has about one-sixth as many miles of railroad as the United States. There are only seven countries in the world that have more miles of railroad than the State of Texas. Do you think that under Government ownership, with all of its attendant ills, we would to-day have the great system that we have? I warn the people of the undeveloped sections that they had better think twice before they embrace this Government-ownership theory. All the money that could be raised would not be enough to make the improvements wanted in the developed sections where they have enough representation here to outvote the sparsely settled sections. I here put in the Record the number of miles of railroad in the leading countries of the world:

Number of miles of railroad in the leading countries of the world.

Country.	Year.	Miles.
United Kingdom.....	1914	23,701
Germany.....	1913	37,894
France.....	1913	25,373
Belgium (State).....	1912	2,913
Holland.....	1915	2,339
Switzerland.....	1913	3,292
Italy (State).....	1913	8,461
Austria.....	1913	14,434
Hungary.....	1913	13,520
Denmark (State).....	1914	2,333
Norway.....	1917	1,975
Sweden.....	1912	8,659
Spain.....	1912	9,291
Portugal.....	1910	1,521
Russia.....	1913	41,622
Western Australia.....	1917	3,370
Bulgaria (State).....	1913	1,242
Roumania.....	1913	2,205
Canada.....	1917	38,604
Brazil.....	1912	10,821
Argentina.....	1914	21,161
Japan.....	1917	5,853
India.....	1915	35,285
Egypt (State).....	1912	1,485
South Africa.....	1915	9,209
New South Wales.....	1917	4,313
New Zealand.....	1917	2,970
Queensland.....	1915	4,939
Victoria.....	1917	4,101
South Australia.....	1917	2,221
United States.....	1917	252,029

During the next two years the opponents of these doctrines must be vigilant, as there is going to be conducted a campaign for Government ownership the like of which this country has seen few times in the past. I know not what course others may take, but as for me I intend to resist with all the force I possess any attempt to commit the party of which I am a member to this destructive and socialistic heresy.

I thought when we passed the railroad-control act that the railroads should be held a reasonable time after the war for good reasons, and the principal of these was that whatever remedial legislation was desired should be passed. The act provides 21 months after the formal ratification of peace. I thought then, and think yet, that this period was long enough, and I sincerely hope that the necessary legislation may be passed and that they may be turned back to private control at even an earlier date. I therefore do not favor the recommendation of the Director General of Railroads to extend the Government operation for five years after peace is declared, for I know if Government control is extended for five more years that it means permanent Government ownership and operation. Millions of money must be spent upon the railroads within the coming five years, and I know that with all of these millions of Government money in the railroads that we will be so enmeshed in Government operation and control financially that we can never get out.

The retiring Director General of Railroads says that he wants this five-year extension of Government control in order

to take the question out of politics, yet a five-year control would place it beyond two more presidential elections. The incoming Director General of Railroads says that he wants a five-year extension of Government control so that the question may be fully discussed in the political campaigns that are to come. The same as I am against a five-year extension of Government control because I know that the question is to be unsettled and in the politics of the country for five more years, I am also against the recommendation of the railroad executives that a secretary of transportation be named as a member of the Cabinet, and as others argue the railroad executives say they want to take the question out of politics, yet they would name a Cabinet officer secretary of transportation as the supervisor of railroad operations in this country, whose office would change with each changing administration and would plunge the question into politics and keep it there continuously.

Much has also been said about regional control. I have not yet heard a plan announced for regional control and operation of railroads that I believe is feasible. If we have regional operation of railroads we must do one of three things, in my opinion. We must first have one control and one ownership in the region which would be necessary if we are to have a region, in order that poor roads and rich roads alike may survive; for under one single system the profit or loss would be spread out over the whole system; or, second, in this region rates must be set high enough, if there are to be separate systems, that the poor road can get enough money to maintain itself, which rate would allow the rich road to make more than would be just and fair, and the only way that this could be equalized would be to tax out of the rich road above a certain percentage of its earnings the remainder of its earnings; or, third, a rate must be set in that region on all railroads, considering the rich and the poor road, which would be presumably just and reasonable, but under which the rich road would make money and the poor road would lose money, and that the surplus of the rich road would be taken and applied to the deficit of the poor road.

These are the only three ways that I can understand or that I have heard advocated that a region be adopted and operated, and I can not subscribe to either. Instead of destroying the State commissions, as some would advocate, they should be used for all of the valuable information that they may possess and allowed to exercise their proper functions, and in this way make the State commissions the directors for the State regions. I quite agree, therefore, with the recommendation of the Interstate Commerce Commission that a better understanding should be brought about between the State and Interstate Commissions. They are both great instrumentalities for good, and instead of the antagonism that has heretofore existed between them they should work in the fullest harmony. I believe further that when the Interstate Commission is considering a case that affects a railroad that enters a State that the commissions of those States should be officially notified and allowed to appear either in person or by representative.

Mr. Chairman, I can see nothing in the present situation that make it any supertask as to turning the railroads back to private control, and I fear that the idea that is so prevalent that some radical changes must be made and a maze of new law enacted will cause the advocacy and probable passage of wild and needless legislation. There are some things that I am definite should be done and some that should be given our best consideration, which at this time I am not sure as to the wisdom. When I say that I think private control and ownership is much preferable to Government ownership and control, I do not mean to justify many acts of railroad management for many things done in the past, nor acquit them of the injustices that they have practiced toward the public. A railroad wrecker is a commercial highwayman and should be dealt with as any other robber. He should have the extreme penalty of an extreme law.

Much complaint has come from the railroads that they have been unable to raise money by sale of their securities to make needed improvements. This lack of confidence of the investing public in railway stocks and bonds has been the fault of the railroad owners themselves. In the past they have issued and sold securities based on nothing but wind and water that represented nothing in the hands of innocent purchasers but hope, and that has usually been a vanishing hope.

In 1914 I introduced a bill to give the Interstate Commerce Commission control over the issue of securities of railroads, which bill passed the House almost unanimously but never got through the Senate. I still advocate the measure as one of the vital things that should be done before the railroads are turned back to private control. I believe that before the railroads should be allowed to issue any additional securities, that they should come before the Interstate Commerce Commission, present their full case, and be forced to justify the issuance of



these securities; lay before the Interstate Commerce Commission what they intended to do with the money and receive the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission of the issue before they are allowed to put them upon the market.

After these securities have been put upon the market and sold, the railroads should then, at the call of the Interstate Commerce Commission, be compelled to go in and show that they spent the money for the purposes for which they asked that the issue be made. I believe that it should be made so that railroad securities in this country should represent value the same as any other sort of security. The railroad companies should have no secrets from the public; therefore their books and papers, letters, files, and all should be open to the inspection of the accredited representatives of the Government. When the railroads make an application to the Interstate Commerce Commission under this system for approval of an issue of securities, the different State commissions, through which the railroad runs, should be notified of the application and of the hearing, and be allowed to appear in person or by designated representatives to present the facts as they get them from their supervision of the railroads in their State. And while I am upon this point I desire to say that power should be given so that there may be a complete and a definite understanding between the Interstate Commerce Commission and the different State commissions. In other words, I would adopt the recommendation of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which is as follows:

That, without abdication of any Federal authority to finally control questions affecting interstate and foreign commerce, the commission be authorized to cooperate with State commissions in efforts to reconcile upon a single record, the conflicts between the State and the interstate rates.

There should be a better unification of service and especially of terminal facilities. The railroads should be allowed or should be forced to have common terminals, operated so that there will be no discrimination between roads. There should also be a unification of ticket offices, which would, indeed, effect a saving. I also believe that under the strict supervision of the Interstate Commerce Commission that some forms of pooling of traffic and equipment should be allowed.

Furthermore, I think that under proper supervision freight should be routed over the shortest or the least-congested lines, to the end that it will reach its destination in the shortest time and hence in the least expensive way. Then, I think that the question should be taken up and well considered as to giving the same body that controls the rates the power of control over wages. This is a question upon which I express no definite belief at this time, but one that I think within the 21 months that we have for Government operation should be considered. Federal incorporation is advocated from many quarters. This is a question that should be taken up and given the fullest consideration. However, I at this time express doubt as to its wisdom or as to the country being ready to receive it.

There should be some way devised in railroad operation under which there would be a better understanding between employer and employee. It should no longer be that each should think that the other is his enemy. I sometimes think that probably the man who gets promoted to one of the higher positions forgets that the fellow down in the ranks from which he came is the same kind of a fellow that he was when he was also down in the ranks.

Mr. Chairman, the railroad question is only one of the many seriously important ones that will come before the Congress for consideration. None are so tremendous that they can not be solved if the statesmen of this day will, without fear, speak their minds and vote their convictions. This I intend to do. I know if I am right that my people will sustain me. I have supreme confidence in the fairness and intelligence of the American public, and I would warn the politician of this time that the great heart of America is sound and will stand for no attempt at deception. We have a great opportunity and a great work to do. Let us put our hand to the plow and not look backward until this labor is done.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in this Government and its institutions. On my desk and in my room at my hotel and also on my desk at home, down on the farm in Texas, I keep a copy of the Constitution. When I read it I many times think that the men who wrote must have been inspired by the One who notes even the sparrow's fall and knows all things. We should wait long before we do anything that would change the fundamentals of the Republic. Next to my religion, I believe in my Government, and if I should ever attempt knowingly and purposely to strike at its foundation, I hope that my best arm may fall useless to my side and that my tongue may speak no more.

Give us men at this tragic hour with strong hearts and true; men who are willing to sacrifice; men who are willing to lay

political ambition on the altar of right and justice; men who will use their God-given talents to a fearless solution of these mighty problems and to the preservation of the best and freest Government ever devised by the wisdom of statesmen or wrought in the blood of heroes.

For the information of Members, I here insert in the RECORD the bill as introduced by me for the control of the issuance of securities by common carriers and which passed the House in June, 1914:

SEC. 20a. That from and after the passage hereof it shall be unlawful for any common carrier subject to the act to regulate commerce, as amended, to issue any capital stock or certificate of stock or any bond or other evidence of interest in or indebtedness of the carrier (hereinafter collectively termed "securities"), or to assume any obligation or liability as lessor or another carrier, or as lessee, guarantor, surety, or otherwise in respect of the securities of any other person, natural or artificial, if connected with or relating to that part of the business of such carrier governed by the act to regulate commerce as amended, even though permitted by the authority creating the carrier corporation—

(a) unless it be for some purpose within its corporate powers and in the public interest, necessary or appropriate to the proper performance of its service for the public, and not intending to impair the financial ability of the carrier to discharge its duty to the public; and

(b) unless and until, and then only to the extent that, upon application by the carrier, and after investigation by the commission of the purposes and uses of the issue and the proceeds thereof, such issue is approved by order of the commission as reasonably necessary or appropriate for the purposes stated.

"Each such application shall be made in such form as the commission may from time to time determine and prescribe, and shall set forth such matters as the commission may require, including:

"First. (a) The total amount of proposed issue, and how authorized by or on behalf of the carrier;

"(b) The number and amount of all of its securities outstanding at any time prior to the date of such application, the amount thereof retired prior to said date, the amount thereof then undisposed of, and whether such amount is held in the treasury of the corporation as a free asset or pledged, and, if pledged, the terms and conditions of such pledge;

"(c) The number and amount of securities then to be issued, and whether to be sold, pledged, or held in the treasury of the corporation as a free asset, or otherwise disposed of or applied, as the case may be, specifying number and amount in each case; if any such securities are to be sold, the terms and conditions of sale; if any part of the consideration to be received therefor is other than money, an accurate and detailed description of such consideration; if any such securities are to be pledged, the terms and conditions of pledge; or if other disposition or application is to be made, a full and detailed explanation thereof;

"(d) The number and amount of its securities so authorized, but not then to be issued;

"(e) If the issue is of shares of stock, the number thereof, the face or par value thereof, if any, specifying whether common or preferred, and the number and kinds of then outstanding shares previously issued.

"Second. The preferences or privileges granted to the holders of any such securities; the dates of maturity, rates of interest, or fixed dividend, whether cumulative or not, and any conversion rights granted to the holders thereof, and the price, if any, at which any such securities may be retired or redeemed.

"Third. The purposes to which the proceeds of the issue are to be devoted, in such detail as the commission may require.

"Fourth. In case of proposed assumption of any obligation or liability in respect of the securities of any other person, natural or artificial, like showing shall be made as to the financial condition of said other person, as also of the objects sought and benefits to be realized by the carrier from such assumption, to be accompanied by copies of any agreements or contracts therefor.

"Every application for authority, as also every certificate of notification hereinafter provided for, shall be made out under oath, signed, and filed on behalf of the carrier by its president, a vice president, auditor, comptroller, or other executive officer having knowledge of the matters therein set forth and duly designated for that purpose by the carrier.

"Whenever any securities set forth and described in any application for authority or certificate of notification as pledged or held as a free asset in the treasury of the carrier shall, subsequent to the filing of such application or certificate, be sold, pledged, repledged, or otherwise disposed of by the carrier, such carrier shall, within 10 days after such sale, pledge, repledge, or other disposition, file a certificate of notification to that effect, setting forth therein all such facts as are required by subdivision (c) of the foregoing first paragraph, or as may be required by the commission.

"Upon application to the commission for approval of proposed issues of securities the commission shall cause notice to be given to the railroad commission or public service or utilities commission, or other appropriate authority, of each State in which the applicant carrier operates. The railroad commission, public service or utilities commission, or other appropriate State authority, thus notified shall have the right to present before the commission such representations as they may deem just and proper for preserving and conserving the right and interests of their people and the States, respectively, as involved in such proceeding. The commission may hold hearings, if it sees fit, to enable it to determine its decision upon the application for authority.

"Nothing herein shall be construed to imply any guaranty or obligation as to such issues on the part of the United States.

"The foregoing provisions of this section 20a shall not apply to notes to be issued by any said carrier maturing not more than two years after the date thereof and aggregating not more than 5 per cent at any time of the securities of said carrier then outstanding. Within 10 days after the date of such notes the carrier issuing the same shall file with the commission a certificate of notification, in such form as may from time to time be determined and prescribed by the commission, setting forth as nearly as may be the same matters as those required in respect of applications for authority to issue other securities.

"The commission shall require periodical or special reports from all carriers hereafter issuing any securities, including such notes, which shall show, in such detail as the commission may require, the disposition made of said securities and the application of the proceeds thereof.

"All issues of securities contrary to the provisions of this section may be enjoined by any court of competent jurisdiction at the suit of the United States, the Interstate Commerce Commission, or of any direc-



tor, officer, or stockholder of the carrier proposing to make the issue; and any director, officer, attorney, or agent of such corporation who assents to, or concurs in, any issue of securities forbidden by this section 20a shall upon conviction be punished by a fine of not less than \$1,000 nor more than \$10,000, or by imprisonment for not less than one year nor more than three years, or by both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.

"From and after the passage hereof it shall be unlawful for any officer or director of any operating carrier to receive for his own benefit, directly or indirectly, any money or thing of value, in respect of the negotiation, hypothecation, or sale of any securities issued or to be issued by said carrier, or to share in any of the proceeds thereof, or to participate in the declaring or paying of any dividends of an operating carrier from any funds properly included in capital account, or otherwise than from the revenues of said carrier. Any violation of these provisions shall be a misdemeanor and on conviction in any United States court having jurisdiction shall be punished by a fine not less than \$1,000 nor more than \$10,000, or imprisonment for a term not less than one year nor more than three years, or by both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court."

I here insert in the RECORD a statement made by the Hon. W. C. Adamson, at that time chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House. This statement was made at the time Judge Adamson was retiring from Congress and from membership on the Newlands committee. It is so full of wisdom and good common sense, for which he was famed, that I can not refrain from here again calling the attention of Members of the House to it:

STATEMENT OF W. C. ADAMSON, VICE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBER OF THE JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE.

MR. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman and associate members of the joint subcommittee, inasmuch as I am to sever my connection with the committee and not be present to join in a report, I shall embrace the opportunity afforded by the committee to express a few of my impressions.

It is obvious to me from the investigations held in San Francisco and general conditions that during the war it is not practicable to give satisfactory consideration to the subjects before the committee, much less to make a final report. The public attention is so engrossed in subjects connected with the war as to be reflected in the testimony of every witness. Naturally, witnesses are considering war conditions, and when we try to consider permanent peace practices and regulations the tendency is to try to apply to them the same treatment that is appropriate to war conditions, which is a mistake.

The truth is, all consideration should be given now to war conditions until we win the war, which we must and shall win sooner or later at all hazards regardless of cost. Until that is done all other considerations must be subordinated and all plans and arrangements for peace conditions, such as conducting business in time of peace and the securing of prosperity through private and public enterprise, must be postponed until that period arrives. The mischief of confounding plans for operation in time of peace with war conditions is that diametrically opposite conditions require entirely different treatment. In time of war we need centralization and consolidation, national mobilization of all instrumentalities and all lines of business, and individual enterprise must submit to such conditions of regulation and control as will support war purposes, whereas in time of peace we need general diversification and dissemination of enterprise and energy so as to enliven every portion of the country, stimulate every avenue of business, and production and distribution through individual and local enterprise under local control, which make the ideal conditions of peace.

We have already provided for the mobilization of our industries and resources during the war with a dispatch and efficiency unrivaled by any democracy, if not unrivaled in history, and this in spite of the fact that pessimists have prophesied this was impossible. We must not allow special and designing interests to take advantage of feverish and abnormal conditions during war to perpetuate these conditions to fetter and cripple honest private enterprise, investment, and prosperity when peace comes. During the war discussion of matters in time of peace hereafter to come can be at best but academic—in fact, if indulged in should be only academic, else it might produce either one or two evils—first, diversion of attention necessary to war maneuvers; second, perpetuation of war methods and application of them to peace times.

The propositions of the railroads were made before our participation in the war, and we entered upon their consideration. I hope my views on their propositions may be of some value in the final conclusions of the committee.

The basis of the railroad propositions is the lack of sufficient revenue and repressive, punitive, and unfriendly legislation. It is obvious that the railroads need revenue, but it is equally obvious that their representations have grossly exaggerated the situation and placed it before the committee in an imperfect light, not discriminating between strong and weak railroads and not disclosing to the committee the different figures and conditions of different roads nor assigning the true causes of such financial straits as exist.

Our railroad system is the pride of the country, the best and greatest in all the world, even after making allowance for the lamentations of all the pessimists. It must be preserved, but admission of the fact that it must be preserved does not logically lead to the conclusions insisted upon. I think every railroad in the country should be made safe to the public, safe for life and limb of travelers, and safe for prompt and expeditious carriage and delivery of all property, and it should be safe to the investors in the sense that they are allowed to enjoy profitable return on their money invested, and safe to the operators who depend upon their personal labor and attention for the daily bread of themselves and their families.

The excuse for appealing to Congress for redress is that the Government has hampered the attainment of these ends by repressive and restrictive regulation.

The carriers, in order to insure an ideal system conforming to the conditions which I have already stated, should be enabled to furnish in some places three and four tracks and more, and in all places double tracks, sufficient terminal facilities, and motive power promptly to transport all passengers and freight. It is believed that fair treatment of the public, such as they are entitled to, would insure to the railroads revenues, enough to meet all these demands.

Is it true that the railroads have been deprived of realizing these necessary revenues through unjust and punitive regulation? I deny it. When attention has been called to particular measures for regulation, it has been admitted by the advocates of this revolution that such has not been the result of a single Federal statute. The basic principle of

our system of regulation is that rates and practices must be "reasonable and just." No honest man can object to that. Railroads should not make money by rates and practices that are not "reasonable and just."

They can not complain of a general system of regulation, because, although fighting such regulation at every step, the carriers themselves now generally admit the wisdom of the legislation. It can not be claimed that the prevention of rebates and special privileges was injurious or repressive, because many of the carriers themselves advocated that legislation. They can not deny that the law prohibiting the issuing of free passes resulted to their benefit. In fact, they told the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that if relieved of that burden they would carry passengers at a much lower rate. Free transportation should be forbidden. The transportation of employees should not be called free transportation. It should be provided for as a part of compensation.

They can not complain at the safety-appliance laws, for the carriers have generally participated in that legislation and have sanctioned the general principles, claiming usually that they have voluntarily been doing all that legislation or necessity required.

Without further enumeration it is safe to say, as I have already done, that no particular act can be justly criticized by the carriers as punitive and unduly restrictive.

Then they reduce the statement to the general complaint that they can not make profits because we control their practices, their rates, and their revenues, and that it is all done by politicians and not by business men. That statement is refuted by the fact that the Committee on Commerce in the two Houses have been composed for generations of the very best business men in the country, not only able lawyers, but men who have had experience in all sorts of litigation concerning transportation and other business, and they have had the advice and assistance in every instance of all the available skill and experience of the railroad experts both in administrative and operating departments of carriers in the United States.

When driven, however, from criticism of Federal regulation they say the trouble is with State regulation, and they want to be freed from 48 different masters. Well, if we taken your position and viewpoint with the millionaire investor, with no interest in the carriers or in the public except to derive dividends from stock or bonds, or take our place with the high-salaried directors and officers of the companies who wish to avoid all regulation possible, and all friction and labor possible, in transacting their business, we may be able to reconcile our minds to revolutionizing our system of government, denying and dethroning the authority of the 48 States, depriving local communities of conveniences and assurance of proper consideration and service in order for one central authority at Washington to make easy corporate operation and render certain large dividends by the proposed step. That view of the case, however, assumes and sanctions a historical and political revolution of our system.

The sovereign States were here first. They made the Government. With them rests the propagation of natural persons and the creation of artificial persons or corporations. Before railroads were ever dreamed of the makers of the Constitution realized that some States were discriminating against other States and that it was desirable that interstate commerce should freely operate throughout all the States. In order to overcome the discrimination of one State against another State, the commerce clause of the Constitution was enacted, giving the Federal Government the power to regulate interstate commerce.

It was not adopted for the purpose of destroying the power of the States to regulate transactions wholly within their borders, but for the purpose of enabling each State, while surrendering the power of discrimination against other States, to do business in all other States on equal terms. No purpose of the Constitution has been so widely perverted as has this particular proposition, intended solely for the purposes stated.

When we examined the great and able lawyer who represents the committee of 15, representing a portion of the railroads in the United States, he in his honesty and candor admits that that power of the Constitution does not authorize Congress to go into the internal affairs of any State in railroad matters or otherwise. But he proposes, at the behest of the committee which he represents, a system of Federal incorporation, and then he admits, as a lawyer, that a Federal corporation will have no more rights under the commerce clause of the Constitution than a State corporation. Congress, under that clause of the Constitution, has plenary power over all instrumentalities alike, no matter where a man is born nor where a corporation is chartered nor where a partnership has its headquarters, for physical and sovereign control over all such instrumentalities applies alike to all, without exception or qualification. The qualification applies not to the form or person of the instrumentality or its origin but only to a line of demarcation, to wit, is the operation within a State exclusively or does it appertain to more than one State?

The truth is that the idea, not of the distinguished lawyer who represents the railroad committee—he would not entertain such a thought—but it is prevalent throughout the country that there is a glamor and potentiality apparently investing anything with a Federal name that carries irresistible force everywhere that, bearing such credentials, an agent claiming Federal authority will infringe and fudge and the people will yield. Something akin to moral intimidation will break down local opposition and barriers and that a Federal incorporation would enable things to be done with less friction and resistance. That idea is fortified by a long historical list showing different assertions about the intentment of the clause and the manner of its construction—a long list dangerous to our liberties in connection with the Federal Government.

When that compromise was agreed upon Jefferson and his disciples apprehended and Hamilton and his disciples fully anticipated that Federal construction would lead to the extension of the powers conferred by Federal Constitution, and that accordingly by construction the centralizing idea which seemed to fail of expression in the Constitution would reap full fruition by construction. For strict construction a large number of wise patriots in the country have always contended. Unless we stand with that body of wise patriots we will hasten the destruction of the Republic, which will inevitably come sooner or later through liberal construction which permits Federal legislation and enforces it by more liberal construction.

Entertaining such views, I regard Federal incorporation not only as dangerous but as entirely unnecessary. The proposition "to rid the carriers of 48 masters" is a misleading statement. The persons who bought up these railroads have done so of their own volition, which they had a right to do and operate them cum onore, induced thereto solely by financial considerations. The proposition to change



our form of government to add to their convenience or gains is entirely untenable. The charters granted by the States were intended for local purposes and were consented to by the people from considerations of local conditions, convenience, and profit. Rights of way, local concessions, local control of schedules and connections, the prosperity of towns and communities based on such considerations were all moving factors in original construction.

The fact that final ownership of these railroads has passed to bondholders, stockholders, and other chance investors does not justify disregard or destruction of these conditions. To say that our transportation is a national question is a misleading catch word. It sounds big and is useful in time of war, as has already been shown. In time of peace it is a matter for local consideration. The country is made up of local population and local and individual interests. Its greatness depends on local enterprise and local prosperity. It is sometimes convenient for a tourist or commercial man to hurry from Boston to California, but it is irritating to the local communities, on which the carrier is dependent for its prosperity, to see these palace trains dash by without noticing the localities on which they depend for revenue and verdicts in the courts while relegating the local population to second-class trains, which run before day and after dark, and which often make long waits at connecting points for those selfsame through trains. It would be profitable to the carriers to stop and study considerations of sound policy right there. Furthermore, it is not true that any of these carriers have as yet succeeded in dominating 48 States by ownership of all the railroads. It will be a sad day when they do; but if they should, it would not justify them in changing all laws to suit their convenience in all States.

Every business man has a right to do business in every State, but when he goes away from his own State he must behave himself as a gentleman and conform to the local police regulations for morality and good conduct in all those States. The owners of railroad stocks and bonds and the officials of the carriers are mere humans, citizens of the United States and of the various States, and have no superior right to claim any greater immunity from local submission than have other citizens.

The restrictive provisions contained in Federal and State laws are all leveled at bad men, not good ones. They do not inflict injustice and are not offensive to any honest railroad man any more than laws against immorality and crime are offensive or repressive to preachers and other good men in the country. Such laws are made for the protection of good men by curtailing the evil conduct of bad men.

All benefits of the commerce clause of the Constitution can be easily secured under the present plan of regulation. If we destroy the present Commerce Commission and establish regional commissions, the regional commissioners would be appointed at Washington. They would not be representative of the localities. They would not necessarily be representative of the public view in any locality, and under any suggested plan of review or appeal ultimately all authority would be exercised by some sort of commission at Washington. The new plan like the present plan must be executed by mortal men and their efficiency depends on their personal merits and efforts. The Federal Government can secure just as good men under the present system as under the proposed new plan. The trouble with reformers now and always has been, if you can call this a reformation, is that instead of trying to correct abuses by amending existing systems and executing existing laws they always want to do away with what exists already and undertake new legislation and new systems. If the reformers would first try to enforce present laws awhile, at least far enough to give them a fair trial, and suggest necessary amendments, it would be found much wiser and better.

We have lately amended the present law by adding two commissioners and authorizing subdivisions of the commission, each with power of the commission, with the action of each subdivision subject to revision by the entire commission. The membership should be increased to 15, and they should be selected from every part of the country. There would be no difficulty in providing for and carrying out the present scheme, and it would be better if the commissioners should hold investigations in all parts of the country and discontinue the present system of making these investigations through agents and examiners. If \$10,000, the present salary, will not secure the ablest men in the country, it is easy to increase that salary. It is the most important body in the country and should be composed of the ablest and best men, and that could and would be accomplished as easily as with any other possible board.

Every benefit possible under the commerce clause of the Constitution can be realized under the present system. The line between interstate commerce and internal police authority is not definitely defined. It is a matter for ascertainment in each particular case. It is certain the Federal Government is the final arbiter as to where that line can eventually rest. If the present commission has not sufficient authority to condemn every State act which interferes in any way with interstate commerce, Congress can easily make that power clear. When Congress enacts such a statute and the Supreme Court construes it, then it is final.

I apprehend that ultimately the action of the Federal Government will leave very little control over transportation in the States themselves. Every transportation company, railroad or otherwise, which is necessary to the service of the people can be made a participant in interstate commerce, whether it desires so or not, for it can be connected with interstate carriers. Then every act of a State touching that carrier which interferes in any way with the free operation of interstate commerce will be illegal and void when the Federal Government occupies the field. It is certain it may do so and it seems inevitable it will do so. If so, let it come in an easy, progressive, constitutional, and natural way and not be precipitated by sudden and violent action.

So far as the financial operations of interstate carriers are concerned, there is no doubt of the power of Congress to enact appropriate legislation at least far enough to protect the carriers against themselves and one another against frenzied finance and misappropriation of funds, compelling wise application of funds so that the physical condition of the carriers will be improved instead of impaired by irresponsible operation and administration at the expense of the properties themselves and the safety of the public.

The House has once passed the Rayburn bill and the House committee has reported it a second time. If that bill should be enacted into law, in my judgment, it would meet all the necessities of the case, provided the carriers will adjust their rates and practices to insure fair treatment of the different communities in the United States and the development of those parts of the country which need development, thereby creating new and larger and more profitable fields for revenue instead of scrambling for revenue and traffic already created and depleting the revenues of other carriers by such a scramble.

So far as the proposition for Government ownership is concerned, it is absolutely useless in the first place, because whatever regulatory power the Government would have as a sovereign it may have and exercise over the operation of everything within its boundary regardless of ownership. It would have no more power over the regulation of interstate carriers as the owner of the carriers than it does have as the sovereign. It would have no more sovereignty over its own properties than it has over the holdings of other owners, and it would not exercise its power of sovereignty over its own properties to the detriment of the properties of private citizens. If the Government should encumber itself with the operation of all the railroads it would involve itself in political confusion and corruption unspeakable, which alone would offset any possible advantage suggested by the disordered mind of the wildest theorist.

I wish to call the attention of the committee to what I consider the most important subject, next to destroying the Kaiser, in time of war and of peace, and that is the liberalizing of the general dam act so as to induce private capital to improve the navigable streams. The possibilities of development in this country are so great that even if only partially realized the existing transportation facilities will be totally inadequate to distribute the products of our farms, mines, and factories. The navigable waters of the country should be made to carry most of the heavy freight. It is not probable that the Government will make all these improvements in a hundred years. They are very expensive and the number is large.

Almost every navigable stream in the country, however, is interrupted or broken by shoals, which attract capital to develop water power for the generation of hydroelectricity. Almost every such stream can be made to pay at least the expenses of its own improvement for navigability. In addition to that, they would be dotted with all sorts of factories. The electricity generated would electrify most of the railroads in the country and save coal. It would manufacture almost all commodities. It would not only produce from the air nitrates for war purposes and for agriculture, but it would be used to manufacture steel in the most approved methods and soda and aluminum, and cotton goods and woolen goods, and almost every conceivable thing needed for foreign and domestic trade, all of which furnish inducements to private capital to improve the shoals. Up to this time little streams which are nonnavigable have been relied upon, and the proposition has been clouded and confused with the question of dealing with power sites on the public domain of which the United States is the owner as well as the sovereign. These public-land sites and the nonnavigable streams are capable of comparatively small development and benefit, and those who promote water-power development should be induced, if not compelled, to develop the navigable rather than the nonnavigable streams, and the inducements are so much greater because of the much larger power obtainable. If permitted by law, they would be developed instead of the minor streams.

We enacted a general dam law in 1906, of which capital was rapidly availing itself. Many consents of Congress were granted and a great many companies were formed. With several projects constructed under that law, further development was suspended because certain persons in the country started a propaganda to the effect that we were giving away something to private monopoly. Our committee conferred with the authors of that propaganda and tried to agree with them on terms. For instance, they demanded that the Government should retain the power to regulate production, practices, and charges. We arranged to provide that. They insisted that the Government should retain the right to impose all conditions requisite to the public good. We agreed to provide that. It was insisted that the Government should reserve the right to charge an annual amount, based on the benefits to the promoter or grantee, with due reference to the benefits to navigation, and we agreed to that. Finally objection was reduced to the concrete form of demanding that the grantee should submit to a stipulation that he should not only construct such locks, dams, and other structures as required at the time of approval of his plans and specifications, but should thereafter put in such other structures at his own expense as might be required by the Government at any time during the life of his grant, and the further demand that annual charges might after 20 years be changed by the Government without the consent of the grantee, and might be changed each 10 years thereafter without the consent of the grantee. Of course, such stipulations would induce no capital to build dams. Other potent obstruction comes from existing electric companies, who assume an attitude similar to that assumed by the leading railroads, to wit, that development is practically finished.

The railroads say no other railroads should be built unless the present railroads need them and do the building. The present electric companies object to the further development of other electric enterprises through fear that competition would reduce the price of electric current, although such reduction would be of great benefit to the public in the building up of the country and break their strangle hold on prices and popular prosperity. They are willing for extensions to be made provided they can control extensions and prices. This suspension of construction has enabled them to acquire property rights at most of the sites, for the original owners were unable to hold unprofitable property, and sold it to the water-power trusts, the only purchasers in the restricted market. It is necessary to liberalize our legislation to provide for condemnation proceedings, so that other investors may secure these sites for improvement if the companies holding them persistently refuse or fail to develop them. I commend the entire subject to the committee for the consideration its transcendent importance deserves.

I shall attach to my statement nine exhibits, showing some efforts of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to amend the general dam law and also to control railroad securities.

Mr. MANN. I understand. The opportunity has not been very great during the last week or so, but we are now on the Agricultural bill, making rather rapid progress upon it, and no other appropriation bill is pressing. There is no other appropriation bill that has been reported, except the pension appropriation bill, which would not take 15 minutes to pass, except for the general debate, probably, and there is no likelihood of the Army bill being reported very soon; and I do not know when the naval bill will be in, but it never comes in on time, or it never has in my experience.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I am not going to object to the gentleman's request, but I had hoped that the gentleman would make his



speech in the House, because the members of the committee upon which the gentleman serves tell me it would be in all probability a very interesting and elucidating speech.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I know I voice the sentiment of many Members on this side of the aisle who would like to hear the gentleman from Texas deliver this speech on the all-important subject of Government ownership of railroads. I think the membership of this House would be willing to stay here half an hour longer and allow the gentleman now to proceed to deliver that speech. Would the chairman of the committee have any objection, in view of the manifest expression of interest in the gentleman's remarks, to permitting him to proceed for half an hour?

Mr. LEVER. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it is hardly fair to the Committee on Agriculture, as much as we would like to hear the gentleman's speech. I regard him as one of the ablest men in this House, but the Committee on Agriculture has important business ahead of it. I have arranged for a conference with certain gentlemen touching the wheat-guaranty price on Saturday, and I am very anxious to finish this bill in time to attend to that matter. Next week the committee is going to be engaged practically all the week in trying to work out some plan by which the Government can keep its faith with the wheat farmers of this country.

In addition to that the Committee on Agriculture has other matters that it ought to give attention.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman just withhold that for a moment?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The chairman will agree that we are making very good headway on his bill. There are not very many items that will provoke debate. Does not the gentleman feel certain that we shall finish this bill at an early hour to-morrow afternoon?

Mr. LEVER. I hope so.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why would the gentleman not be willing to make an exception now?

Mr. LEVER. Why not agree that at the conclusion of the consideration of this bill the gentleman from Texas may have his time?

Mr. STAFFORD. That would prevent the gentleman from Texas attending very important committee meetings.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman from Texas will do that, I shall be glad to promise to help make a quorum and secure him an audience.

Mr. STAFFORD. I suppose it would be more agreeable to the gentleman from Texas to go on right now, and we could stay an hour later this evening.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. I have read the letter from the Federal Horticultural Board in regard to the plan for international prohibition, and, while it has some facts in it that might be new to me, the scope of the letter is in no wise new and it does not throw light on the question that I sought information about.

Mr. LEVER. I have not read it myself.

Mr. MANN. Well, the letter is misinforming in one respect. It says the objection comes because of a letter sent out by Henry A. Dreer, of Philadelphia, one of the great seed merchants of the country. This regulation has been discussed in a great many florists' and gardeners' journals, regardless of the statement of Mr. Dreer. I have not seen the statement of Mr. Dreer, but I have had communications from a great many people who, like myself, are interested in amateur gardening, and letters from a great many people who, knowing my interest in the subject, have written me because of their interest in commercial propositions. In the main, while they criticize the order, I think the desirable thing they wish to know is whether this order is absolute and is going to stand; whether the Federal Horticultural Board, vested with power, has made up its mind that it is going to enforce the plant quarantine for protection to American industries in the florists' and nurserymen's lines, or whether, as suggested by the latter end of this letter, it is going to yield on nearly everything that anybody kicks about—because that is the intimation in this letter.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. In some letters that I have received they seem to have objected to this order as to certain plants, azaleas,

and things of that kind. Has the gentleman any information on that subject?

Mr. MANN. Most of our azaleas and fancy rhododendrons and most of the foliage plants and everything of that sort, for both outside and inside, we import from Belgium, or did import from Belgium in the past. We have not imported any in the last few years. They come to us in the main wrapped up with the balls of earth around the roots. They are wrapped. The Department of Agriculture claims, and perhaps justly—and I am not criticizing the claim at all—that the importation of diseases and insects in the dirt is very dangerous, not to mention the importation of the same things in the superstructure of the plant. But those things will be absolutely cut out. They can not raise those things in this country profitably.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The Gardeners' Club of my State are going to hold a meeting in February, and they are going to take up the subject. They think it will injure the business.

Mr. MANN. It is going to revolutionize the business of the florists and nurserymen if it is enforced. That is what I am trying to find out—whether they had made up their minds to keep it or whether this is a tentative proposition to find out how much kicking there will be. They need not solace themselves with the idea that the kicking is going to come only from Mr. Dreer, of Philadelphia. It is universal, I may say.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For acclimatization and adaptation investigations of cotton, corn, and other crops introduced from tropical regions, and for the improvement of cotton and other fiber plants by cultural methods, breeding, and selection, and for determining the feasibility of increasing the production of hard fibers outside of the continental United States, \$104,410: *Provided*, That not less than \$7,500 of this sum may be used for experiments in cottonseed interbreeding: *Provided further*, That of this amount \$3,000 may be used for experiments in the production of New Zealand flax in the United States and for its utilization in the manufacture of blinder twine.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I do so for the purpose of calling the attention of the chairman of the committee to the wording on page 24, line 14, a matter that we have passed, where the words are unusual, and such as we have refused in other places to use.

Mr. LEVER. On what line is it?

Mr. MANN. Line 14, page 24, "That not less than \$7,500 of this sum may be used," and so forth.

Mr. LEVER. I suggest that the gentleman offer an amendment to cure that.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It should say, "Of this sum \$7,500 may be used."

Mr. LEVER. That is in my print of the bill now.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It says, "not less than \$7,500."

Mr. LEVER. That "not less than" ought to be cut out.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I think it should read—and I think the committee will agree with me—"that of this sum \$7,500 may be used."

Mr. LEVER. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] offers an amendment. Will the gentleman repeat his amendment?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It should read, "of this sum \$7,500 may be used."

Mr. MANN. It depends on what is intended by it. It is easy to see how the language in the bill to which the gentleman calls attention is not correct. The last Congress required that \$7,500 be used. I take it that this committee did not intend to require that \$7,500 be used, but only to permit it to be used.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MANN. Of course, in that event the gentleman's amendment is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] asks unanimous consent to return to line 14, page 24, for the purpose of offering an amendment, which the Clerk will report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Page 24, line 14, after the word "not," strike out the word "less" and insert the word "more," and transpose the words "of this sum" to follow the word "that," so that it will read: "That of this sum not more than \$7,500 may be used for experiments in cottonseed interbreeding."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That is not as I offered it, but it will do.



Mr. LEVER. That is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For testing and breeding fibrous plants, including the testing of flax straw and hemp, in cooperation with the North Dakota Agricultural College, which may be used for paper making, \$16,760.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Certain Members of the House who served on the famous Mann pulp and paper investigating committee are interested in the investigation and development work provided for in this paragraph:

For testing and breeding fibrous plants, including the testing of flax straw and hemp, in cooperation with the North Dakota Agricultural College, which may be used for paper making, \$16,760.

Can the gentleman from South Carolina tell the House of the status of this work, and whether this is a perennial appropriation that results in any good at all to the paper industry?

Mr. LEVER. The testimony before the committee was to the effect that the principal work now being done is on flax, with a view to manufacturing paper for the making of paper money, and that their work is progressing very satisfactorily. Of course, we did not hold very extensive hearings on this bill, but I was more encouraged by the brief statement that was made about this than I have been for some time. I think they are going to get some results out of flax.

Mr. STAFFORD. Have they progressed to any extent in the commercial manufacture of paper of any kind out of flax or hemp?

Mr. LEVER. No; not at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. They are just merely doing laboratory work?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I suppose the gentleman can assure us that this appropriation will continue for many, many years?

Mr. LEVER. This appropriation, like all appropriations for investigation work, for the solving of such problems, is quite likely to continue.

Mr. CRISP. It is like Tennyson's brook—it goes on forever.

Mr. STAFFORD. After the very illuminating information I have received from the gentleman from South Carolina, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To cultivate and care for the gardens and grounds of the Department of Agriculture in the city of Washington, including the keep and lighting of the grounds and the construction, surfacing, and repairing of roadways and walks; and to erect, manage, and maintain conservatories, greenhouses, and plant and fruit propagating houses on the grounds of the Department of Agriculture in the city of Washington, \$11,690.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that item. The Committee on Agriculture has no jurisdiction to report appropriations for the city of Washington or any part of the expenses of running the Agricultural Department within the District of Columbia.

Mr. LEVER. I think the gentleman's point of order is probably good, but I trust he will not make it. This item has been carried in this bill ever since I have been a member of the Committee on Agriculture, and it provides only for the keeping up of the grounds, buildings, and greenhouses, and the like of that, on the Agricultural Department grounds.

Mr. MADDEN. The Park Board have jurisdiction over all that work, and they are no doubt doing it very satisfactorily.

Mr. LEVER. I do not understand that they are doing anything of the kind. As I say, this appropriation has been carried in this bill ever since I have been a member of the Committee on Agriculture, for 16 years. I suppose it is subject to a point of order if the gentleman wants to make it. I have not looked into it lately—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that it is not his first impression that this item is subject to a point of order; but if the gentleman from Illinois has any authority, the Chair will be glad to hear him.

Mr. MADDEN. The Committee on Appropriations has jurisdiction over the appropriations for all the departmental expenses and everything connected therewith within the District of Columbia. This Committee on Agriculture has no jurisdiction over appropriations except outside of the District of Columbia.

Mr. LEVER. I made the statement that this is probably subject to a point of order. I remember some years ago, before I was chairman of the committee, this bill was all cut to pieces on the floor of the House by some one making points of order

that this committee had no power to report appropriations for purposes within the District of Columbia. This item may stand in a different light from that general proposition. It seems to me that if we are going to have an Agricultural Department, and going to have greenhouses and things of that kind, there ought to be power somewhere to appropriate for their upkeep, and that is all this does.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Chair made the remark that he made, he did not quite understand the point of order of the gentleman from Illinois. The Chair will ask if there is any committee reporting appropriations for the care of the grounds and immediate surroundings of the different public buildings.

Mr. MADDEN. The Committee on Appropriations, in the District of Columbia appropriation bill, report appropriations for all improvements within the District of Columbia.

Mr. MANN. No other bill carries an appropriation for the care of the grounds of the Agricultural Department. The District of Columbia appropriation bill carries items for the care of various grounds, and the sundry civil bill carries an appropriation for the care of the Smithsonian grounds, but there is no other committee that takes care of the Agricultural Department grounds. Probably the only thing that is subject to a point of order here is the words "to erect."

Mr. LEVER. Of course, if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] desires to press the point of order, I would rather cure it somewhere else, because it is necessary for them to erect small buildings for greenhouse purposes.

Mr. MANN. The item was carried in the bill when they were erecting greenhouses as they needed them. Probably they not not need any this year.

Mr. LEVER. I hope the gentleman from Illinois will withdraw his point of order. I am satisfied that there is no duplication.

Mr. MADDEN. I think the Department of Agriculture goes to a lot of extravagant expense in maintaining the surroundings of buildings in which clerks are occupied and which is entirely unnecessary.

Mr. MANN. Will my colleague yield for a moment?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am one of the few who goes through the conservatories or greenhouses, properly so called, of the Department of Agriculture on the grounds. They have a few men there who are expert hybridizers. The head of the greenhouses is a wonderful man, and he has a number of men under him who have developed more benefit to the country for the same expenditure than can be found anywhere else in the country. All sorts of plants are hybridized by hand fertilization; the seed is saved and planted and the greenhouse records kept. They keep developing some new kind of plant, some new kind of bean or wheat, or something of that sort, that is of inestimable value. That work has not been anywhere else in the world as efficiently done as it is done here. Any Member of the House who wants to get intensely interested in that subject should go down there and try to get hold of Mr. Peters, or some other man under him in the greenhouses, and he will learn more about the wonderful possibilities of the development through cross fertilization and hand fertilization and hand hybridizing than anywhere else in the world, unless he goes to Dr. Van Vleeck out here in Maryland.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I hope that my friend from Illinois will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I was wondering what prompted my colleague to make such wonderful observations of the beautiful flowers that are propagated at the agricultural gardens around the office of the Secretary of Agriculture in order that the aroma may pass through the windows of the Secretary on a warm day and give him something of pleasure. I take it that most of the items for which money would be expended under this provision of the bill would have nothing to do with the raising of flowers at all. It includes the heating and lighting of the grounds. That I suppose is done by electricity drawn from the power plant of the Potomac Electric Power Co., and it does not require any of these artistic means that my colleague speaks about to change the colors of the flowers to that of the rainbow to do that work. I see, too, that this expenditure provides for the resurfacing and repairing of the roadways and walks, and I assume that they are made of gravel and cement and that no flowers are mixed with the gravel and cement, and hence there is no necessity for hybridizing flowers in that connection.

Then, I see, too, the paragraph provides for the erection of buildings, the management of buildings, conservatories, greenhouses, propagating houses and grounds, but nowhere do I see



anything about raising flowers or the wonderful genius that may be needed for that purpose. But, notwithstanding my failure to understand the necessity for this great work of art about which we have heard, I am persuaded by the smiling countenance of the gentleman from South Carolina and the persuasive argument of my colleague that nothing would be gained by insisting on the point of order, and hence I withdraw it.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase, propagation, testing, and distribution of new and rare seeds; for the investigation and improvement of grasses, alfalfa, clover, and other forage crops, including the investigation of the utilization of cacti and other dry-land plants; and to conduct investigations to determine the most effective methods of eradicating weeds, \$139,780: *Provided*, That of this amount not to exceed \$57,800 may be used for the purchase and distribution of such new and rare seeds.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. May I ask why the amount of the appropriation here is reduced for the purchase of new and rare seed?

Mr. LEVER. That is due to a transfer to the statutory roll. It is really not reduced. It is due to a transfer to the statutory roll of two clerks, class 1, and one clerk at \$1,000.

Mr. MADDEN. So it had nothing to do with the purchase of seed, but it was to give a permanent job to somebody on the temporary rolls.

The Clerk read as follows:

For general administrative expenses connected with the above-mentioned lines of investigation, including the office of the chief of bureau, the assistant chief of bureau, the officers in charge of publications, records, supplies, and property, and for miscellaneous expenses incident thereto, \$29,040.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the gentleman from South Carolina if this apparent reduction in the bill is occasioned in some way by the transfer of clerks to the statutory rolls?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The current bill carried \$91,000 and this bill \$82,700. As a matter of fact, it ought to be twice that.

Mr. LEVER. Eight thousand seven hundred and forty dollars has been transferred to the statutory rolls.

Mr. MADDEN. Let me ask the gentleman a question, if I may. I move to strike out the last word. How much did the gentleman say had been transferred to the statutory roll?

Mr. LEVER. Under that item, \$8,740.

Mr. MADDEN. That would make the two items come to about \$38,000.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. How much of an expenditure does this general administrative bureau have jurisdiction over?

Mr. LEVER. This takes care of the office force of the chief of the bureau—his own immediate administrative force.

Mr. MADDEN. I mean the total expenditures under the jurisdiction of the administrative branch of the bureau?

Mr. LEVER. That is \$29,000 and odd.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think the gentleman understands me. Of course, he would not spend \$29,000 to run the office force without some duties. What duties do they perform?

Mr. LEVER. They perform the ordinary duties of an administrative officer.

Mr. MADDEN. Over what branch of the service? How much money do they get altogether?

Mr. LEVER. I do not think I get the gentleman's point.

Mr. MADDEN. For example, this says "for general administrative expenses connected with the above-mentioned lines of investigation." How much money is expended altogether in this investigation?

Mr. LEVER. None of this money would be expended on investigation. This money would be expended on clerical hire.

Mr. MADDEN. I understand that. What I want to get at is, What percentage of the total amount of money expended under the jurisdiction of this bill in this bureau does this amount to?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman will see below that the total is \$3,294,000, so that this \$29,000 would be a little more than 1 per cent. That is about the way it runs ordinarily.

Mr. MADDEN. It is a little over 1 per cent.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchase and distribution of valuable seeds: For purchase, propagation, testing, and congressional distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants; all necessary office fixtures and supplies, fuel, transportation, paper, twine, gum, postal cards, gas, electric current, rent outside of the District of Columbia, official traveling expenses, and all necessary material and repairs for putting up and distributing the same; for repairs and the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$358,980. And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to expend the said sum, as nearly as practicable, in the purchase, testing, and distribution of such valuable seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, the best he can obtain at public or private sale, and such as shall be suitable for the respective localities to which the same are to be apportioned, and in which same are to be dis-

tributed as hereinafter stated, and such seeds so purchased shall include a variety of vegetable and flower seeds suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture, after due advertisement and on competitive bids, is authorized to award the contract for the supplying of printed packets and envelopes and the packaging, assembling, and mailing of the seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, or any part thereof, for a period of not more than five years nor less than one year, if by such action he can best protect the interests of the United States. An equal proportion of five-sixths of all seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, shall upon their request, after due notification by the Secretary of Agriculture that the allotment to their respective districts is ready for distribution, be supplied to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution among their constituents, or mailed by the department upon the receipt of their addressed franks, in packages of such weight as the Secretary of Agriculture and the Postmaster General may jointly determine: *Provided, however*, That upon each envelope or wrapper containing packages of seeds the contents thereof shall be plainly indicated, and the Secretary shall not distribute to any Senator, Representative, or Delegate seeds entirely unfit for the climate and locality he represents, but shall distribute the same so that each Member may have seeds of equal value, as near as may be, and the best adapted to the locality he represents: *Provided, also*, That the seeds allotted to Senators and Representatives for distribution in the districts embraced within the twenty-fifth and thirty-fourth parallels of latitude shall be ready for delivery not later than the 10th day of January: *Provided, also*, That any portion of the allotments to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress remaining uncalled for on the 1st day of April shall be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture, giving preference to those persons whose names and addresses have been furnished by Senators and Representatives in Congress and who have not before during the same season been supplied by the department: *And provided, also*, That the Secretary shall report, as provided in this act, the place, quantity, and price of seeds purchased, and the date of purchase; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from sending seeds to those who apply for the same. And the amount herein appropriated shall not be diverted or used for any other purpose but for the purchase, testing, propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, mulberry, and other rare and valuable trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out this entire section. I make this motion for the reason that I think the best opinion throughout the country is that this is a very unwise and unnecessary appropriation or expenditure of money. If anybody here could assert truthfully that the Government was going to furnish the farmers or others a quality of seed which they could not buy from ordinary dealers, there might be some excuse for making the appropriation, but it is common knowledge that the seed that is distributed from year to year in this way is of exactly the same quality as they can buy at the store at the nearest town. I have had a good many letters each year from my district from people asserting that the seed was not even as good as the average quality of seed sold by reputable houses. But assuming that it is as good, I am absolutely unable to see any reason why we should furnish at big expense something which a farmer can buy for a few cents with the utmost convenience as he goes to town to get his mail. It does not seem to me that there is any excuse at all for the appropriation. It will be noticed also that this year we are proposing to expend 50 per cent more than we have expended before. Is not that correct, I will ask the chairman of the committee?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. It is proposed now to add 50 per cent to an appropriation item which always has been attacked here every year since I have been here.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the answer that the chairman of the committee made probably is misleading to the committee.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I can not yield to the gentleman, as my time is very limited.

Mr. HEFLIN. Then I shall follow the gentleman and make a statement.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I have made only two statements since I got up. One is that this seed is of no better quality than the farmers can buy anywhere, and the other that the appropriation has increased 50 per cent. I do not see how the gentleman can correct either. I am unable to see why anyone can feel that he is adding in any way to his prestige in his district by sending out these small packages of seeds to the farmers. I am partly of the opinion that it is a political liability, to send them out, because an increasing number of farmers from year to year are getting to understand—

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes.

Mr. WASON. Do I understand my colleague to say that the distribution of these seeds is a liability? Did he use the seed accredited him under previous acts by sending them into his district?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I will tell the gentleman that last year I passed the buck to others. I reached the conclusion that personally I did not care to select those to whom they might be sent, and I sent them to some people who gave it out that those who thought they could use them could come and get them.



I realize that some one is going to follow me now and say that those who happen to object to this appropriation ought not to use any of the seed. I do not think there is anything inconsistent about distributing the seed if voted by Congress and a certain quantity is set apart for each congressional district in the country. As long as Congress buys the seeds and places them at our disposal, I think the people of my district are entitled to their share. There may be some trifling value to them, and whatever value there is, I propose they shall have, but it does seem to me that it is a waste of money.

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. It seems to me that it is a waste of money to buy these seed and send them out, when perhaps three out of every four men who get them do not want them or have no use for them and would sooner buy them at the store. If it were proposed to use the money for rare or new kinds of field seed, such as the farmers could not otherwise secure, I would not object to the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, this item brings up the annual discussion about free seeds. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be concluded in 10 minutes, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] to have five.

Mr. MANN. There are several gentlemen here who desire to be heard.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman had better make it 30 minutes, and then he will be getting off lightly.

Mr. LEVER. I will make it 30 minutes with the understanding that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLE] shall have five.

Mr. MANN. Make it 35.

Mr. LEVER. No; I include him in the 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from South Carolina indicate who is to have time?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] to have five minutes, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] to have five minutes, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] to have five, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] desires five, and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BAER].

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from North Dakota was to have five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. How much is that?

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty-five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the request that debate close in 30 minutes. That takes care of everybody.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 30, line 8, strike out "\$358,980" and insert "\$239,320" in lieu thereof.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment be adopted it will provide the same amount of money as was available last year for this purpose. The Secretary of Agriculture in making his estimates and suggestions to the committee asked for \$239,320 for this work. The committee added 50 per cent, or \$119,660. I think that increase was unwise, and I think the whole thing is a very cheap proposition.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. In just a moment. I would like to have the whole thing stricken out, but I believe the temper of the House is to make some appropriation for this work, and I believe, and I hope, it will agree with me that the amount of money that was available last year, the very large sum of \$239,320, will be enough. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. What was the object of increasing the fund? Was that occasioned by the increased cost of seed?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. No; I think it was not on account of increase of cost of seed. It was made to increase the amount of money available to add to the allotment of seed which each Member will receive. There was some talk about the increased price of seed, but there is a difference of opinion about that. Some well-informed men say that the price will be higher; others, I believe just as well informed, say the price will be lower. In fact, I heard the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN],

who has large information on this subject, express the opinion that seeds will likely be lower than they were, so that the idea that the seeds may be high in price will not justify the increase of this appropriation by \$120,000. The increase was made in the committee for the purpose of providing a larger allotment for each Member under this distribution, and it is very questionable indeed whether an appropriation of this kind ought to be made at all. I trust that the committee will decide that the old amount is sufficient, and that amount can be had by adopting my amendment.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, this increase is only 50 per cent over the amount provided for in the last appropriation bill. Members who really represent agricultural districts have complained that the provision in the old bill did not furnish seeds sufficient to go around. This provision as it now stands restores the provision that was in the law prior to the last appropriation bill, and I submit to gentlemen if we are going to distribute these seeds at all they ought to be supplied in sufficient number to cover those districts where people really need them and want them. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] suggests by his amendment that we cut out this additional amount and leave the old amount that was in the bill before. Now, unless you could find out who in the district wants seeds and needs seeds, his amendment should not be adopted, because if you are going to send seeds out in this way you are liable to send them to people who do not want them, and you are liable to leave those who do want them and need them without seeds. So I submit to this committee that with the vast appropriations that this Congress is making for things that help every other class of people, that we ought at least to be willing to expend this small amount for rare seeds, the best seeds that the Government can buy from time to time, to send out to the farmers in the various sections of this country, and I think it were much better if gentlemen could suggest economy along other lines, rather than to follow the suggestions of the great seed houses, who have always fought this appropriation, and who have always tried to cut it down, because they hoped to be able to sell seed in the localities where the Government now sends this high character of vegetable seeds. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. I will.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the old arrangement each Member obtained 25,000 packages of garden seed and 3,000 packages of flower seed. This year we get only 14,000 packages of garden and I do not remember how many flower seed, but we do not have the privilege of exchanging garden seed or flower seed one for the other, and does not the gentleman think if we are going to send these seed out and attempt to cover the district that instead of leaving it as it was before it ought to be doubled, so as to be enough to go around to the people of the various districts?

Mr. HEFLIN. I would support a proposition to give even a larger amount of these seeds to the various Members, to be distributed among the Members generally, than we have provided for in the bill. I hope what we have in it will remain there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I can speak as one coming from an agricultural district in regard to this item. Perhaps the conditions there are quite different from some others, but we regard this as a very important provision. I have in the years that I have been here received only one or two letters opposed to this appropriation, and they came, as I found out on investigation, from what you might call "bonanza" farmers, like the Grandins and the Dalrymples, who have large estates, with fine buildings, with automobiles and all the accouterments of wealth, like so many of the farmers in the district of my friend from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. But in my district we have probably two or three thousand new settlers. They settled in the timber country, where it takes time as well as lots of labor to develop farms, and they have only a few acres cleared. They have to go out into the "bonanza" district of North Dakota to work in the summer in order to earn money with which to pay living expenses and to gradually develop their lands. These small farmers are all anxious for these seeds. And the statement made by the gentleman from North Dakota that these seeds are for sale at near-by stores is hardly justified. Especially is it unwarranted so far as my district is concerned. The people who want these seeds are in many cases, I think, 25 to 30 miles from where the seeds can be bought. If any of these stores have garden seed, they get them without any skilled assistance in selecting them. The bill here is to authorize the department to purchase and propagate and test for congressional distribution valuable seeds and bulbs and vines. Where can you buy bulbs and vines in a country store? They have got to be selected and distributed in



accordance with the suitability of the seeds to the different localities. They can not be purchased by the department without an investigation as to the suitability and value of these seeds for a particular locality. Now, the seeds that are sent promiscuously from the seed houses to the stores are not selected with the care with which these seeds are selected. Therefore, the contention the gentleman makes, that you can buy equally as good seeds in the stores as can be secured from Government distribution, is unwarranted.

Another class of people outside of the new settlers that want these seeds, as I have found from experience, are the people who have small gardens, the people in villages and towns who are, perhaps, mechanics and employed in the mills and factories, and who have a little plot of ground which they can cultivate. And the encouragement by the Government of war gardening has stimulated the demand for this seed, which everyone found out who had charge of this distribution last year. In addition to that, I have in my district from 7,000 to 8,000 Indians, whose original occupation was that of hunting and fishing and war, but whom the Government has gradually sought to train to a life of civilization by teaching them industry, and especially agriculture. The children gradually acquire a taste for the cultivation of the soil. The greatest demand I have for seeds has come from the people on White Earth and the Red Lake Indian Reservations, and especially from the schools. The school-teachers there tell me the children manifest a wonderful desire to have seeds and to watch their development and growth, and the crops raised from them, and this helps the very work the Government is carrying on, and upon which it is spending millions of dollars in the United States, to encourage civilization and self-support among them.

The only opposition I have discovered to this item comes from the rich farmers and, perhaps, from those who read too seriously the farm journals. These farm journals generally ridicule the items more effectually than anybody has ever done on the floor here. But if you turn over the pages of these periodicals you will find page after page of seed advertisements. So it is perfectly plain that the motive for it is not for the benefit of the people but for the benefit of the seed houses.

I hope the appropriation will remain in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, in the discussions of this question on former occasions I have never expressed my views, but I have always voted for an appropriation of this kind. I am in favor of this appropriation as it is proposed by the committee, and I am opposed to the amendment offered by my distinguished friend from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN]. This year we have but 14,000 packages of seeds allotted to each congressional district. This is only half enough for an agricultural district. I think if we send out these seeds at all we ought to have a quantity sufficient to go to practically all our farmers. And I assume if seeds go down in price the Secretary of Agriculture will not need to expend this entire amount.

Now, it is true that I have occasionally had letters from men who seem to be opposed to this so-called congressional seed distribution, but now, after 10 years of experience and somewhat intimate association with the people of my district, I believe that a very large majority of the people in my district, in the cities and towns as well as in the country, are in favor of this appropriation and of this distribution of seeds. I have been surprised how many men in the cities—lawyers, bankers, merchants—have written me special letters asking me for these seeds, not that they were not able to pay 10, 15, or 25 cents for seeds, but they wanted some from the congressional distribution. They have written me often for them, and I receive every year thousands of letters asking me for such seeds. Of course there are some of my constituents who get them who perhaps do not care for them, but there are thousands who write me for them. Now, then, there are some who believe, on account of the propaganda carried on by certain papers, that this distribution is made solely to help reelect Congressmen.

In all candor I do not believe that is true, and I say here honestly and truly that if I thought this appropriation was made and I voted for it simply to help elect myself to Congress I would be unworthy of a seat in the House of Representatives if I voted for it. But I have believed and I believe to-day that this distribution of seeds, when it is properly done, is a means of linking the farmers of this country to the National Government, and there is nothing so important to the stability and the welfare of this Nation as to have the farmers of this Nation in a friendly attitude toward the Federal Government. It is not the value of the seeds, but it is in a way a recognition of the farmer and his industry.

So I am for this appropriation, because I believe it is in the right direction and in accordance with the right policy.

I had a letter a year ago from the editor of the leading daily paper of my State asking me to turn a portion of my seed distribution over to that city, although it is not in my district. A few days ago I had a similar letter, and the writer goes on at length to tell how, by the use of the seed in that great city, in developing home gardening among the poor, he has been able to do a great deal of good. I am for this entire appropriation. I am opposed to reducing it. I think it is a proper expenditure of the public money [Applause.]

Mr. BAER. Mr. Chairman, before I was elected to Congress there were criticisms in certain periodicals, such as the Searchlight on Congress, criticizing Congress for the sending out of free seeds, books, and pamphlets as a perverted system of politics. Several of my constituents have told me that when I got down to Congress they wished I would not send them any seeds. They preferred to have enacted good legislation, such as a grain-grading law and other matters relative to the distribution and marketing of farm products. In order to ascertain the popularity of free seeds, I sent out a letter, in which I embraced a statement asking whether or not these seeds were desired. I inclosed a list of bulletins issued by the Department of Agriculture. Out of 30,000 letters sent to my district I received 1,200 replies. These names constitute my live list for seeds.

But since the war began I found a new manner in which we can very usefully distribute these seeds. I had the pleasure of dining with Dr. Francis, who is the head of one of the school-garden commissions in this country, and it is surprising to know what they have done in this country toward encouraging the children in the schools to grow gardens. This is of great consequence to this Nation. We talk of the "back to the land" movement, but sometimes we do not act just as we preach. I think that the school-garden movement is inciting in the children an appreciation of the value of land and encouraging and inspiring them to ultimately become landowners. It is an excellent and worthy movement, which demands greater appropriations and more earnest attention of Congress. I am taking the balance of my seeds and sending a number of packages to each school, with a letter encouraging the children to see how much they can raise in their little gardens this year.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAER. Certainly.

Mr. PLATT. Has the gentleman ever succeeded in getting the Bureau of Plant Industry to put up seeds that are peculiarly adapted to the school gardens? I find that they are inclined to put up seeds such as the children can not use.

Mr. BAER. No; I do not favor the attempt to produce butterfly effects and flower seeds. We want something that the children can raise to show them the actual value which they can receive from the soil by cultivating it.

If we are to have free seeds, I believe we should have the full amount of this appropriation and should not cut it down at all. But if we are going to do away with the proposition in the Department of Agriculture, I would prefer that it be transferred to the Bureau of Education, so that the seeds can be distributed directly to the schools and superintendents through the head of this school-garden movement. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, how much time did the gentleman from North Dakota use?

The CHAIRMAN. He had two minutes remaining.

Mr. MANN. Perhaps the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] could use those two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Kentucky will be recognized for the two minutes remaining of the time allotted to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BAER].

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have always been enthusiastically and overwhelmingly for this garden-seed appropriation. [Applause.] I want to say further that I am bitterly and uncompromisingly opposed to any amendment reducing the amount [applause]; which means, of course, that I propose to fight all these amendments that have been offered. [Applause.] I wish I had it in my power to increase the appropriation, because the amount reported by the committee will not be sufficient to give each Member a quota large enough to enable me to send a package to each housekeeper in my district, and that means that I will have to keep up my former practice of begging and borrowing them. [Laughter and applause.] My judgment is that no greater harm could be done in the estimation of the public to this great Department of Agriculture, which is doing such magnificent work for the farmers of the country, than would result from the abolition or even the further curtailment of this garden-seed distribution. [Applause.] I have private information to the effect that this seed distribution next spring will have a lot more



corn and beans in it than heretofore. Of course, we all want the beans, of which there has been a dearth for a good while, and I imagine that all are interested in helping to avoid a fall off in the corn crop for one reason and another. [Applause.]

Some reference has been made in the debate on this paragraph to the fact that a great many people do not want these seeds sent to them, and when they are sent they do not use them. I have found very few cases like this in my district. Wherever I hear of a fellow who makes fun of the garden-seed distribution or indicates in any way that he does not want them, I take particular pains to strike him off my seed list. I send them only to those who want them, and that means practically everybody in the tenth Kentucky district. [Applause.]

Referring to those Members of Congress who are always opposing this appropriation, I think it would be a good idea, and certainly a just one, to amend the bill so as to take their quotas away from them and pro rate what they would otherwise get among the balance of us Members who do want them. [Applause.]

I realize that there are some sections of the country, particularly in large cities, where they do not raise much garden stuff, and some sections where they prefer hops and other agricultural products not included in the congressional distribution. Now that these other products are less profitable than they used to be, that is no reason why they should raise Cain with us farmers who still want the garden seed sent out.

Some gentleman remarked a few moments ago that he was not voting for continuing the distribution of garden seeds, because it helped him in his races for reelection to Congress, and that if that was his reason he would be unworthy of his seat. I do not mind confessing, incidentally, that I am conscious of the fact that sending everybody in my district a package of garden seed does not decrease my popularity. If I thought it would have that effect I might hesitate long and seriously before I would vote for the seed distribution [applause], and I imagine that a good many others would do likewise. But speaking seriously, gentlemen, I am for the continuance of this custom and for its enlargement, because I know it is of great value to the people of the country, and especially to the farmers. It increases their interest in agriculture and stimulates production, and it also makes the people out in the country feel that the Government at Washington is interested in their welfare and that their Congressman remembers them and is desirous of helping and serving them. [Applause.] But, Mr. Chairman, I see that the Chair and the House are impatient to hear the immortal bard from the Tombigbee, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER], and I give way to him. [Applause.]

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. Sisson having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendment bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 13274. An act to provide relief where formal contracts have not been made in the manner required by law.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3220) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make investigations through the Bureau of Mines, of lignite coals and peat, to determine the practicability of their utilization as a fuel and in producing commercial products.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill of the following title:

H. R. 8828. An act increasing the limit of cost for the acquisition of a public building site at Yonkers, N. Y.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] is recognized. [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful, indeed, to be thus called out from the Speaker's chair to discuss this important question. [Applause.] Of course it is absolutely necessary each year in Congress to have me express my views on this great question, in order that it may be properly settled and determined in the interests of the country and for the welfare of the people. [Applause.] For that reason I deem it my duty at all times to be present upon occasions like this in order that I may promptly respond to invitations from the Chair as well as from my numerous friends on both sides of this

House, who desire to hear me speak for the entertainment as well as the edification of my fellow Members. [Applause.]

I have been quite ill lately. In addition to that my wife has been seriously ill. My secretary in my office has been seriously sick also, all of us with the influenza. For these reasons I have not been able to attend promptly to my public duties on the floor of the House or in the departments, or even in my office. I regret this very much, because it is my earnest desire to be prompt and efficient at all times. If there is one thing I have tried to do at all times it has been to be prompt and faithful in discharging every duty devolving upon me as a representative of the people. Therefore I am here now under these difficult conditions to protect, if I can, the interests of the plain people, [Applause.]

I always take notice—and I take notice to-day—of the great statesmen on the floor of the House of Representatives. I love them all. I have served with them during all these years in pleasant association. I have seen gentlemen who did not measure up to the high standard of genuine statesmanship arise upon the floor of the House year after year and move to strike out this very important item. [Laughter.] I have seen the real statesmen—among whom I am one—arise year after year upon the floor of the House to advocate and to defend this appropriation. I am glad that in times gone by the statesmen have always prevailed in the advocacy of the expenditure of this small sum in the interest of the plain people of the United States of America. [Applause.] Many efforts have been made to eliminate it, but they have not succeeded, and they will not succeed to-day. [Applause.] The truth of it is, my friends, that this is not only an appropriation that appeals to the people themselves but it is an appropriation that accomplishes real and genuine good. I have heard it said to-day—or insinuated—that these seeds have no value. In order to demonstrate their value I took some packages and put them away last year in my office. This year I took a small box and put it in my office, filling it with soil that I got just outside the House Office Building. In this soil I planted those seeds, which were nearly or about 2 years old, and put a little water on the soil, and every one of those seeds germinated and brought forth the identical plant the name of which was printed on the outside of the package. [Applause.] Still some people say these seeds are no account. The truth is they are the best seed you can get anywhere. [Applause.]

I hope this provision carrying this appropriation will be adopted, and I have no doubt it will be. Then let the other provisions of this splendid bill be approved and the bill in its entirety be promptly passed. Why delay and take unnecessary time in its consideration? There is not a line in it which is not in the interest of the people and for the good of the farmers of the country. That being true, it deserves and should receive the vote of every Member. Stand by the farmers and they will stand by the country, and prosperity and happiness will result. So let us hurry this bill along and pass it, and in doing so render a real service to our constituents and to the country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan) there were—ayes 17, noes 60.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] to strike out the paragraph.

The question being taken; on a division (demanded by Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota) there were—ayes 16, noes 61.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Forest Service: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to experiment and to make and continue investigations and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used for any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate and test American timber and timber trees and their uses, and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek, through investigations and the planting of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect necessary buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building erected shall not exceed \$800; to pay all expenses necessary to protect, administer, and improve the national forests; to ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national forests; and the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, permit timber and other forest products cut or removed from the national forests to be exported from the State or Territory in which said forests are respectively situated; to transport and care for fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or the waters therein; to employ agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in practical forestry and in the administration of national forests in the city of Washington and elsewhere; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate the results of experiments and investigations made by the Forest Service;

to purchase necessary supplies, apparatus, and office fixtures, and technical books and technical journals for officers of the Forest Service stationed outside of Washington, and for medical supplies and services and other assistance necessary for immediate relief of artisans, laborers, and other employees engaged in any hazardous work under the Forest Service; to pay freight, express, telephone, and telegraph charges; for electric light and power, fuel, gas, ice, washing towels, and official traveling and other necessary expenses, including traveling expenses for legal and fiscal officers while performing Forest Service work; and for rent outside of the District of Columbia, as follows.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LEVER: Page 36, line 4, strike out the word "and" between the words "fixtures" and "technical" and insert in lieu thereof the words "law books."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the comptroller has held that the Forest Service, under the words "technical books," has no authority to buy law books and has turned down their vouchers. This is to cure that situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment of Mr. LEVER was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for the use, maintenance, improvement, protection, and general administration of the specified national forests, \$2,069,201: *Provided*, That the foregoing amounts appropriated for such purposes shall be available interchangeably in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture for the necessary expenditures for fire protection and other unforeseen exigencies: *Provided further*, That the amounts so interchanged shall not exceed in the aggregate 10 per cent of all the amounts so appropriated.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. We carry something over \$2,000,000 for general administrative purposes of the national forests. In addition to that we carry total appropriations of about \$6,000,000. What are the receipts from the national forests now?

Mr. LEVER. I am happy to state to the gentleman from Illinois that the receipts from the national forests are constantly increasing. The total receipts of the national forests for the last fiscal year amounted to \$3,574,930.07. That is divided as follows: From timber, \$1,621,000; for grazing, \$1,735,000; for special uses, \$227,000; so that the total is \$3,574,000.

Mr. MANN. I am rather surprised that there has not been a greater receipt from timber during the last fiscal year. There was a very large demand for timber on account of the war, much of it of a character which was furnished by some of the national forests and at rather high prices. We have forests that are costing \$6,000,000 a year, and having the timber under these conditions and have it only amount to one million and a half dollars seems to me rather strange.

Mr. LEVER. We made inquiry as to whether or not the Government got out much timber for aeroplane work from the national forests, and they said no, because it is too far removed from railroad facilities. Most of it was gotten from private property. They said that the prospect for timber sales next year is much larger than ever before, and the receipts for timber for the next fiscal year will be very largely increased. The promise was made years ago that the service would become self-sustaining, and I am glad to say that I think the receipts of the national forests show an increase from year to year.

Mr. MANN. As far as I am concerned, that does not concern me. I doubt whether they will ever get self-sustaining or whether they ever should be.

Mr. LEVER. Except for the permanent improvement, such as trails, roads, and bridges, and things of that kind, that ought to be regarded as permanent improvements, the national forests are pretty nearly on a self-sustaining basis now.

Mr. MANN. I think they are a good ways from it.

Mr. LEVER. That is the statement of the forester before the committee.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt he is honest about it, but it depends upon what is covered by maintenance. Probably they do not cover a great many items, and as a matter of fact the estimate for trails is maintenance, and roads are largely maintenance.

Mr. LEVER. The methods of wood distillation should not be charged to it.

Mr. MANN. Methods of wood distillation ought not to be charged against the account.

Mr. LEVER. The purchase of tree seeds and cones I regard as permanent improvements.

Mr. MANN. Not at all, the purchase of tree seeds for planting trees in the national forests is not permanent improvement; that is current expense.

Mr. LEVER. Then there is the item for silvicultural and dendrological and other investigations.

Mr. MANN. One is for the purpose of investigating the best methods for the conservation and management of forests and forestry lands, and that certainly is current expenses, an investigation of how to manage the thing you have got. That is certainly current expense.

Mr. LEVER. A good deal is spent on the national forests for silvicultural purposes. I feel encouraged at the outlook for the national forests.

Mr. MANN. I have never been discouraged about it, I believe in the national forests and I am not worried as to whether they pay an income at present or not, because they are maintained in the main for the future, but I did think that probably they would dispose of more timber than they have during the war.

Mr. LEVER. They say on account of the location they disposed of very little.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I have always been more or less interested in the national forest reserves under the control of the Agricultural Department, and it has been my understanding for a good many years that they were going to be put on a profitable basis. But I notice that every year as the bill comes in there are appropriations for new activities, and the service runs behind anywhere from two to three million dollars. Here we are told that the prospect for the succeeding year is brighter; that the sun is shining more clearly in the West than it shone the year before; that the rains are wetter than ever before; that the grass is greener and the trees bigger than they have ever been, and the receipts from the sale of timber are greater and the expenses are less. But as the bill comes in from time to time they have appropriations for new activities.

The salaries of the foresters are increased, perhaps the number of foresters is increased, the number of roads to be built up are on a larger mileage, the forest fires perhaps blazed more than they used to blaze, and there is always, first one reason and then another, why the Forest Service continues to run behind. I have rather hoped that we would be able to see the light of day some time in the not distant future, but when one calls attention to that the answer is that the trees are growing higher than they used to and they shut out the light of the sun.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is always humorous. Let us see what the facts are.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, facts are very interesting things on occasion.

Mr. LEVER. In 1907 the receipts from the national forests were \$3,457,000. In 1914 the receipts were \$2,457,000.

Mr. MADDEN. That is something of a decrease in receipts. What was the increase in expenditures?

Mr. LEVER. The receipts from 1918 were \$3,574,000, in round numbers \$120,000 increase over last year. The estimated receipts for 1919 are \$4,400,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman proceeds further, will he be kind enough to tell me how near his estimates have come to the facts in the past.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, they are not my estimates. They are the estimates of some one else.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, I understood the gentleman to say they were his estimates, or the estimates of his committee, and I assumed, of course, that his committee had become so proficient in estimating the outcome of its activities that by this time it had reached such a state of perfection that its estimates, as related to the facts, would be beyond doubt.

Mr. LEVER. I think the committee as a whole has reached that state of perfection, though I doubt that the chairman has.

Mr. MADDEN. Seriously, Mr. Chairman, I think the committee is to be congratulated upon its great efficiency.

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. WASON. Does the gentleman want to require a higher standing for the Committee on Agriculture relative to estimates than is exhibited by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads?

Mr. MADDEN. If I did, I would have to look up to the gentleman who has just propounded the inquiry. I want to say of the committee that it really has displayed a great deal of wisdom, in some senses conservatism, although extravagant in other senses. As a whole, the committee has been one of the great committees of the House, composed of men of high patriotic purpose. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] has occupied the position of chairman of this committee for a good many years. He is soon about to retire



from the chairmanship, and I want to say of him that I have never known a man acting as chairman of any committee of the House during my membership who has qualified for the position better than he. [Applause.] He not only knows what he is about, but he has given painstaking care to every activity in which he has been called upon to participate. He knows everything connected with the agricultural activities of the country. He has been patriotic, painstaking, conservative, clean, forceful, intelligent, and, on the whole, has earned a right to the confidence not only of the membership of the House but of the people of the United States. [Applause.] I congratulate him upon the great services he has rendered to the American people, and the greatest regret that I have to express is that although I want him to sit beside me as an associate he is not going over to the body at the other end of the Capitol, to which he is so much entitled to go. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of methods for wood distillation and for the preservative treatment of timber, for timber testing, and the testing of such woods as may require test to ascertain if they be suitable for making paper, for investigations and tests within the United States of foreign woods of commercial importance to industries in the United States, and for other investigations and experiments to promote economy in the use of forest products, and for commercial demonstrations of improved methods or processes, in cooperation with individuals and companies, \$173,260.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I beg the pardon of the committee for having to ask information of it in this respect. In view of the claimed scarcity and rather high price of various kinds of print paper and other papers, may I ask the gentleman from South Carolina if he happens to recall what the paper testing bureau is doing now?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I must say very frankly to the gentleman that we did not make any inquiry about that this year.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase of tree seed, cones, and nursery stock, for seeding and tree planting within national forests, and for experiments and investigations necessary for such seeding and tree planting, \$145,040: Provided, That of this sum the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to use so much as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$200, to acquire by purchase land now used as a forest nursery site for the Michigan National Forest.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. I rise for information for, though Michigan is an adjoining State to Wisconsin, I must confess I am not apprised of the Michigan State Forest.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to yield on this proposition to the gentleman from Michigan; I do not happen to see him at the moment—

Mr. STAFFORD. He was here a moment ago. Will the gentleman ask unanimous consent to have that passed?

Mr. LEVER. I shall be glad to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to pass the paragraph, page 45, lines 15 to 22, inclusive. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY.

Salaries, Bureau of Chemistry: One chemist, who shall be chief of bureau, \$5,000; 1 chief clerk, \$2,500; 1 administrative assistant, \$2,500; 3 executive clerks, at \$2,000 each; 10 clerks, class 4; 13 clerks, class 3; two clerks, at \$1,440 each; 20 clerks, class 2; one clerk, \$1,300; 75 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk, \$1,100; 13 clerks, at \$1,020 each; 15 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 2 multigraph operators, at \$1,000 each; 1 clerk, \$960; 11 clerks, at \$900 each; 2 food and drug inspectors, at \$2,500 each; 2 food and drug inspectors, at \$2,250 each; one food and drug inspector, \$2,120; 13 food and drug inspectors, at \$2,000 each; 13 food and drug inspectors, at \$1,800 each; 1 food and drug inspector, \$1,620; 11 food and drug inspectors, at \$1,600 each; 10 food and drug inspectors, at \$1,400 each; 1 assistant, \$1,600; 4 laboratory helpers, at \$1,200 each; 1 laboratory helper, \$1,020; 4 laboratory helpers, at \$1,000 each; 4 laboratory helpers, at \$960 each; 3 laboratory helpers, at \$900 each; 7 laboratory helpers, at \$840 each; 2 laboratory helpers, at \$780 each; 24 laboratory helpers or laborers, at \$720 each; 2 laboratory helpers or laborers, at \$660 each; 27 laboratory helpers or laborers, at \$600 each; 1 laboratory assistant, \$1,200; 1 toolmaker, \$1,200; 3 samplers, at \$1,200 each; 1 janitor, \$1,020; 1 mechanic, \$1,800; 2 mechanics, at \$1,400 each; 1 mechanic, \$1,200; 1 mechanic, \$1,020; 1 mechanic, \$1,000; 1 mechanic, \$960; 1 mechanic, \$900; 2 student assistants, at \$300 each; 2 messengers, at \$840 each; 1 skilled laborer, \$1,050; 1 skilled laborer, \$840; 7 messenger boys, at \$600 each; 3 messenger boys, at \$540 each; 6 messenger boys, at \$480 each; 3 messenger boys, at \$420 each; 2 messenger boys, at \$360 each; 7 laborers, at \$480 each; 13 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$411,670.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. I notice there is a new position created that is designated as one administrative assistant at a salary of \$2,500.

Mr. LEVER. That is a transfer from the lump sum of the food and drugs act.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is he receiving the same salary?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice in this bill the bureau has also three executive clerks at \$2,000. There is a chief clerk at \$2,500, and the gentleman now proposes to have an administrative assistant at \$2,500 in addition to three executive clerks.

Mr. LEVER. The same number is carried.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the necessity of having so many supervisory officials over a clerical force that is not very large?

Mr. LEVER. Well, I confess I do not know the exact details.

Mr. STAFFORD. There are divisions in some auditors' offices where they have only one chief clerk, but here in this bureau you have three executive clerks and a chief clerk besides, and now you intend to create an administrative assistant. Is there not danger of the force toppling over by reason of having too many at the head?

Mr. LEVER. I would not want to admit what the gentleman said before looking into the matter and finding out what these men are doing. It may be they are looking after the food and drug act in some city like New York or Boston. I am not sure as to that.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is certain this man is receiving the same salary at the present time?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, for nearly a year now I have intended, as soon as I could, to prepare some information to suggest to the Congress that it provide an authorization, and if necessary an appropriation, to investigate food values. I have been on a diet personally for over a year, and very likely will be for the balance of my life in a way, with at least a suggestion from doctors as to how much of food values I shall take in the way of proteins, fats, and carbohydrates, which mean sugars, sweets, and starches. The Department of Agriculture some years ago made an investigation of the subject, which is still in the main the standard authority. The Connecticut agricultural department has made an investigation of the subject and various other people have, but the main authority is the report made a number of years ago by the Department of Agriculture. There are various books published giving details of food values. To most of you those are of absolutely no importance, but to many people in the country they are of vital importance. The trouble we have is that they are inaccurate and conflicting. There is a standard book—Locke on Food Values—which is the standard used by many hospitals, and while I was in the hospital at Baltimore passing away the time, in the main feeling very well, I used to read this book and, having a rather retentive memory for things that I try to remember, when I would come to some item in the middle or the latter part of the book which absolutely contradicted a statement in a former part of the book I would return to it, and I amused myself quite a good deal while at the hospital asking my doctor, who had told me to study the food values of this book and to prepare a diet accordingly, which food values he would take in the book, whether the one on page so and so, giving the food value of a certain article of food, or vegetable or fruit, or one on page so and so, giving an entirely different food value.

The only response that I really ever got out of my doctor, I believe, was once when I asked him about grapefruit, which they were feeding me at the hospital. In one place in the book they said that grapefruit was to be charged with 15 per cent of carbohydrates, and in another place they said it was to be charged with 3 per cent of carbohydrates. I said to the doctor, "You are giving me grapefruit here. It makes a good deal of difference, under the tables you give me, as to which percentage is correct." He smiled at me and said, "Mr. MANN, if I were you I would not eat so much grapefruit, but would eat oranges instead." But there is just as much difficulty about oranges.

Now, this is a work that can only be done correctly by the National Government. Tables which were published years ago by the Agricultural Department, in a bulletin which is not now obtainable, are themselves very disappointing.

We had the subject up a while ago of cottage cheese and other cheeses. In these tables that are now published, even in the tables that are in the new books, no lists of cheeses which you can find anywhere in this country or probably on earth by the name are given, and the cheeses you can find you will not find any tables for, usually. They are out of date.

We are always preached to. Food values used to fall from me like water from a duck's back. Farmers know something about food values for the stock they feed. Occasionally they or their wives know something about the food values of the food which they eat in their families, but only in a general way. A man may eat too much protein, which will be extremely deleterious to his health; he may eat too much of fat, which will

be extremely deleterious to his health; he may eat too much of sugar, or starch, or of carbohydrates, which will be extremely deleterious to his health; but he has no way of knowing now how much he is eating.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation and development of methods for the manufacture of table sirup and of methods for the manufacture of sweet sirups by the utilization of new agricultural sources, \$12,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. I notice this is a new activity of the department. What is proposed to be undertaken by the Bureau of Chemistry in the investigation of methods for the manufacture of table sirup and of sweet sirups by the utilization of new agricultural sources?

Mr. LEVER. The department proposes to make some investigation of the methods of manufacturing sweet sirups from grapes, apples, and other fruits. The department is now doing its work as to the manufacturing of table sirups, but it wants to extend its activities to these various fruits from which other sirups can be had.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is that predicated on the idea that the country is going dry next July?

Mr. LEVER. The committee felt we might hope for some relief through this.

Mr. STAFFORD. There are all kinds of substitutes being suggested to appease the thirst, especially in the arid districts of the country. I hope there will be some oases where they may continue to be quenched even after July 1.

Mr. LEVER. I expect that this is rather important work. I never ate any grape sirup, I confess, but I do not see why grapes should not make very fine sirup.

Mr. CRISP. They make good wine.

Mr. LEVER. They make good wine, my prohibitionist friend from Georgia says.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course, prohibitionists are generally authority on wines.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Perhaps this is with a view of making some other city "famous."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For experiments in the manufacture of rare chemicals for use in chemical research, including investigation of domestic sources of supply, \$10,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture may furnish, upon application, samples of rare chemicals to investigators for research work and charge for the same a price to cover the cost thereof, such price to be determined and established by the Secretary, and the money received from sales to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. I am quite interested to ascertain whether this activity could not be more properly performed by the Bureau of Standards. The Bureau of Standards has a large chemical laboratory. It is supposed that their function is to determine the standards of physical contents and, I assume, of chemical contents. You purpose here, in language at least, to have the Bureau of Chemistry perform work that, from my information, should be performed by the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. LEVER. This is the statement that was made to the committee: It is proposed under this new language to enable the Bureau of Chemistry to manufacture certain very rare chemicals, the quantities of which that are used being so small that commercial enterprises will not manufacture them, and they gave us as an illustration a very rare chemical of which the Bureau of Standards itself had on hand a little phial full, sufficient for a whole year in its work. It is to take care of these rare chemicals that the Bureau of Chemistry desired to do this work. It is not contemplated at all that it shall be done on a commercial scale. Dr. Alsberg says this about it:

The situation which led me to suggest to the Secretary of Agriculture the insertion of this item is something like this: There are a great many rare and unusual chemicals and reagents which are absolutely necessary in research that are not being made in the United States and for which we used to depend upon importations from Europe. When the embargo on importations came along an immense amount of research had to stop because the necessary chemicals with which to do it could not be obtained. These are rare materials that are produced in very small quantities and are not matters of ordinary manufacture, but are absolutely necessary if the country is to carry on any extensive chemical research. Now, if we are to hold our own in the chemical industries permanently, I think there is nothing that can be done by the Federal Government that will add more to the development of chemical research and to establishment of a self-reliant chemical industry in the United States than to put some agency of the Government into the position of assisting in research by furnishing to investigators and to others doing research work these rare and unusual chemicals which can not be obtained in the markets.

Then he goes on to give some illustrations.

Mr. STAFFORD. The statement that the gentleman has just read by Dr. Alsberg would confirm my position that the work should be performed by the Bureau of Standards rather than by the Bureau of Chemistry.

Mr. LEVER. Why?

Mr. STAFFORD. Because that is the very purpose of the Bureau of Standards—to ascertain standards of chemicals, as well as physical contents.

Mr. LEVER. This is a process of manufacture, not a standardizing of chemicals at all. It is a proposition to manufacture these chemicals in very small quantities and sell them to people engaged in research work.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, well, in the Bureau of Standards they are manufacturing certain standards and selling them to the trade. For instance, they are manufacturing standards of certain chemicals that are used in the manufacture of steel and selling those standards. They have a large chemical laboratory. All the activities of the Government during the war to determine the proper content of textiles and manufactured articles was performed by the Bureau of Standards. From the President's emergency fund the Bureau of Standards was advanced something like \$300,000 or more. Large buildings have been erected. Those activities are going to continue in peace times. Why should we throw some of that work into the Bureau of Chemistry when we have accommodations in the Bureau of Standards to develop it?

Mr. LEVER. I did not understand from the statement of Dr. Alsberg that the Bureau of Standards is prepared to do this work. As I understand it, there is a pretty clear line of demarcation between the work of the Bureau of Standards and the work of the Bureau of Chemistry in the Department of Agriculture. Of course, this work might as well be done in the Bureau of Standards as in the Bureau of Chemistry, but what is the difference?

Mr. STAFFORD. There should not be any duplication of effort.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. There is no duplication here. This is simply making things in such small quantities that they can not be manufactured elsewhere. The Bureau of Standards is reaching out and encroaching on the Department of Agriculture in many directions, but there are many things that the Bureau of Chemistry in the Department of Agriculture ought to be permitted to do in its own sphere.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is not limited, however, to agricultural work. It is to manufacture chemicals that can be used in any line of activity.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It is to manufacture chemicals that are useful in lines of activity in which the bureaus of the Department of Agriculture are engaged.

Mr. LEVER. If you wanted to manufacture chemicals, you would not go to the Bureau of Standards, but to the Bureau of Chemistry in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. This work is too particular and too fine for the Bureau of Standards. It has to be entrusted to the hands of real chemists who know something about agriculture.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, when it comes to finesse of operation, of course the Bureau of Standards excels any other bureau engaged in any Government activity. The gentleman shows by that statement that he is thoroughly unfamiliar with the character of the work performed by the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. Chairman, for the present I make the point of order, unless we can have positive testimony that it does not conflict with the work of the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit, I will ask unanimous consent to pass this item over until to-morrow. I am satisfied that there is no duplication, but I will get a positive confirmation of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that this paragraph be passed without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire just a little further of the gentleman how is it that the Bureau of Chemistry has anything to do with this matter? Is not the work of the Bureau of Chemistry confined to chemistry connected with agricultural operations?

Mr. LEVER. The work of the Bureau of Chemistry is not confined entirely to matters connected with agriculture, but a large part of the work of that bureau is connected with what is called organic chemistry.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That would apply, however, to the Department of Agriculture, of course?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. The bulk of their work is agricultural chemistry. This is merely a proposition that some agency of



the Government shall manufacture these very rare chemicals, which can not be had in the commercial trade, because the quantity used during any one year is so very small that no manufacturing concern will bother with it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I understand that perfectly; but the trouble is, it seems to me, that this is simply an entering wedge to enlarge the work of the Bureau of Chemistry in the Department of Agriculture, which properly has to do only with the chemistry connected with agricultural operations and has nothing to do with minor chemical operations.

Mr. BAER. It is my understanding that in the organic chemistry that is practiced in the Department of Agriculture they have use for certain acids and reagents that are not required in inorganic chemistry, and that is the reason they want those chemicals, to make the tests on proteids and other things, which are not needed in ordinary inorganic chemistry.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will permit, the very language of this appropriation says that it is to standardize something for use in the Department of Agriculture. Now, just as the gentleman from Wisconsin said, that is the province of the Bureau of Standards, which is standardizing for every department of the Government—the War Department, the Navy Department, the Treasury Department, and so on. Now, this is for experiments in the manufacture of rare chemicals. That is the very work that the Bureau of Standards was created to perform.

Mr. LEVER. Why have a Bureau of Chemistry at all, then? Why not abolish it?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, I can see how there should be a Bureau of Chemistry in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LEVER. Then why are you asking the Bureau of Standards to do chemical work? The very name indicates that it is not a chemical department at all.

Mr. GOOD. This means to make analyses and to enter upon experimental work and discover something and standardize something. That is the province of the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the gentleman from Iowa is entirely mistaken as to the purpose of this item.

Mr. LEVER. Absolutely so.

Mr. ANDERSON. The purpose is to manufacture certain rare chemicals which are used by chemists in order to produce certain reactions. These rare chemicals are not manufactured commercially at all. They are necessary in the trade, but they are used in such small quantities that they are not manufactured on a commercial scale. The purpose of this item is to permit the Bureau of Chemistry to manufacture these chemicals, in order that the trade may have them when it is desired to produce these reactions.

Mr. LEVER. They are to be sold and the money turned into the Treasury.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. This item says it is for research work and experimental work, as we are to understand.

Mr. LEVER. Would you not have the Bureau of Chemistry conduct research work with reference to very rare chemicals, as well as furnish them to the trade?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; that is the work of the Bureau of Standards. Of course, the Bureau of Chemistry in the Agricultural Department, I think, ought to confine its work to biological chemistry, the chemistry which applies to that department. Otherwise you will have these two departments overlapping each other.

Mr. LEVER. We have been getting these rare chemicals from Germany. That is the truth about the matter. We have been importing them, and unless we want to depend in the future, as we have in the past, on foreign nations for things of that sort some one has to do the work. It seems to me that, it being for chemical purposes, it ought to be the Bureau of Chemistry.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. This is experimental work and peculiarly within the province of the Bureau of Standards.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin withdraw his point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. By no means.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this paragraph be passed over.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### BUREAU OF SOILS.

Salaries, Bureau of Soils: One soil physicist, who shall be chief of bureau, \$4,000; 1 chief clerk, \$2,000; 1 executive assistant, \$2,000; 4 clerks, class 4; 2 clerks, class 3; 5 clerks, class 2; 1 clerk, \$1,260; 10 clerks, class 1; 7 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 1 soil cartographer, \$1,800; 1 chief draftsman, \$1,600; 1 soil bibliographer or draftsman, \$1,400; 1 photographer, \$1,200; 5 draftsmen, at \$1,200 each; 1 clerk-draftsman, \$1,200; 2 draftsmen, at \$1,000 each; 1 laboratory helper, \$1,000; 3 laboratory helpers, at \$840 each; 1 machinist, \$1,440; 1 machinist, \$1,380; 1 instrument maker, \$1,200; 1 machinist's helper, \$900; 1

messenger, \$840; 1 messenger or laborer, \$480; 2 messenger boys, at \$480 each; 3 laborers, at \$600 each; one laborer, \$300; one charwoman or laborer, \$480; in all, \$74,160.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to correct a typographical error.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 53, at the end of line 18, strike out \$1,2000 and insert in lieu thereof \$1,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY.

Salaries, Bureau of Entomology: One entomologist, who shall be chief of bureau, \$5,000; 1 chief clerk and executive assistant, \$2,250; 1 administrative assistant, \$2,250; 1 editor, \$2,250; 1 financial clerk, \$1,800; 4 clerks, class 4; 7 clerks, class 3; 16 clerks, class 2; 22 clerks, class 1; 8 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 1 insect delineator, \$1,600; two insect delineators, at \$1,400 each; 2 entomological draftsmen, at \$1,400 each; 1 entomological draftsman, \$1,080; 1 photographer, \$1,200; 1 entomological preparator, \$1,000; 4 entomological preparators, at \$840 each; 8 entomological preparators, at \$720 each; 7 entomological preparators, at \$600 each; one laborer, \$1,080; 2 messengers or laborers, at \$900 each; 1 messenger or laborer, \$840; 3 messengers or laborers, at \$720 each; 6 messenger boys, at \$480 each; 1 laborer, \$540; 1 laborer, \$480; 2 charwomen, at \$480 each; 3 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all \$124,010.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. Is the entomologist, whose salary you propose to increase, the same person recommended for an increase last year?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; he has been in the Government service many, many years.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. I concede it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will reserve it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The committee made the recommendation to increase the salary \$500, took testimony on it, and considered it very carefully. In our judgment the increase in salary ought to be made for an official who has been in the department, as the chairman says, for a long time at the head of this bureau. He has performed able and faithful services. The salary is less than the salary paid to the heads of other bureaus. We felt, after listening to all that was said, and with a knowledge of the work he has been doing and has done, the salary proposed is not too large. We realize that it is subject to a point of order, but it was not put in carelessly and was not arrived at without due deliberation, and it was the unanimous vote of the committee that the salary should be increased.

Mr. STAFFORD. How long has he been there?

Mr. LEVER. He has been there 42 years.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is his age?

Mr. LEVER. Over 60, perhaps nearer 70, but he is still vigorous and able to do good work. He is one of the greatest entomologists in the world.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 23, after the colon, insert "one entomologist, who shall be chief of the bureau, \$4,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of insects affecting cereal and forage crops, including a special investigation of the Hessian fly and the chinch bug, \$147,060, of which sum \$10,000 shall be immediately available.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman a question with reference to this item. My understanding is that this lump sum of \$147,000 includes an estimate of \$25,000 for investigation of and the eradication of the European corn borer. Will the gentleman confirm that?

Mr. LEVER. That is true, and we propose making \$10,000 available for that purpose.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. I understand \$10,000 is made immediately available for the work in that connection.

Mr. LEVER. It is.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of insects affecting truck crops, including insects affecting the potato, sugar beet, cabbage, onion, tomato, beans, peas, etc., and insects affecting stored products, \$84,960.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will the chairman of the committee explain the reason for the large increase in this item of investigational work?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman will recall that last year the Senate put in this bill in the miscellaneous items an appropriation of \$20,000 for certain sweet-potato work. We

have transferred that \$20,000 from the miscellaneous funds to this item, where it properly belongs. In other words, we have corrected an error in respect to the proper place it should appear in the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Preventing spread of moths, Bureau of Entomology: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the continued spread of the gypsy and brown-tail moths by conducting such experiments as may be necessary to determine the best methods of controlling these insects; by introducing and establishing the parasites and natural enemies of these insects and colonizing them within the infested territory; by establishing and maintaining a quarantine against further spread in such manner as is provided by the general nursery-stock law, approved August 20, 1912, as amended, entitled "An act to regulate the importation of nursery stock and other plants and plant products, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain quarantine districts for plant diseases and insect pests, to permit and regulate the movement of fruits, plants, and vegetables therefrom, and for other purposes," in cooperation with the authorities of the different States concerned and with the several State experiment stations, including rent outside of the District of Columbia, the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all other necessary expenses, \$304,050.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. At the top of page 58 there is an item providing for investigational work under the direction of the Federal Horticultural Board. Early in the afternoon the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] directed attention to the ban placed by this board upon the importation into this country of certain flowers and plants which are generally used, most of them coming from Belgium. I rise to inquire whether this appropriation of \$304,000 is the item from which the activities of this Federal Horticultural Board are paid?

Mr. LEVER. No; that item is carried further on in the bill, under the heading "Horticultural Board." It is on page 86.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### BUREAU OF BIOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Salaries, Bureau of Biological Survey: One biologist, who shall be chief of bureau, \$4,000; 1 chief clerk and executive assistant, \$1,800; 1 administrative assistant, \$2,250; 1 executive assistant, \$1,800; 1 financial clerk, \$1,600; 3 clerks, class 3; 6 clerks, class 2; 1 clerk, \$1,260; 10 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk, \$1,100; 1 clerk, \$1,080; 3 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 4 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 clerk, \$840; 1 clerk, \$720; 1 preparator, \$1,200; 1 preparator, \$900; 1 messenger, \$720; 1 photographer, \$1,300; 1 game warden, \$1,200; 2 messenger boys, at \$480 each; 1 messenger boy, \$360; 1 laborer, \$600; 2 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$55,970.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. Will the chairman of the committee inform the House as to how long this biologist has been in the service of the Government, and how long he has been receiving the present salary of \$3,500, on which you recommend an increase of \$500?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, this gentleman, whose name is Nelson, has been in the service of the department since November, 1890, a period of 28 years. He has served as chief field naturalist from 1907 to 1912, and was assistant in charge of the biological investigation from 1913 to 1914. On August 6, 1914, he was appointed assistant chief of the bureau, and on December 1, 1916, was made chief of the bureau. He took the place of Dr. Henshaw.

Mr. STAFFORD. And the salary has been \$3,500 since 1916?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is his age?

Mr. LEVER. I should think that Dr. Nelson is around 50 years of age.

Mr. STAFFORD. He is not superannuated?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, no; he is a very vigorous man.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of asking unanimous consent that I may print in the Record for the information of members of the committee an amendment which at the proper place I propose to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The amendment referred to is as follows:

For establishing and operating a farm produce exchange, the sum of \$1,000,000, or so much thereof as may be required, and the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to establish, at as early a date as practicable, a farm produce exchange, with such branches thereto as may be necessary, in order to afford a medium through which the economic and systematic sale and distribution of farm products may be effected.

Such exchange shall be divided into four sections, designated, respectively, as the grain, cotton, fruit and vegetable, and miscellaneous sections, and such additional sections as Congress may from time to time provide for by specific appropriation.

The commissioners of agriculture of the several States may select, and are requested to select, an advisory committee for each of said sec-

tions, other than the miscellaneous section, composed of three of their number, to act with the Secretary of Agriculture in connection with the sale of the farm products to be sold through the section for which they may be respectively selected, provided, however, the members of said committees shall have been selected by a majority vote by such commissioners based upon the average value, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, of the production of their respective States during the five years preceding such selection of the product or products to be dealt in through the section for which they may be selected. Nothing herein shall prevent an individual commissioner from being selected for the advisory committee of more than one section.

It shall be the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the time the first selection of advisory committees shall be made, and to notify the commissioners of agriculture of the several States of his action with regard thereto; and upon request by a majority vote, based upon production as herein provided, of the commissioners of agriculture shall designate the place where the selection of the several committees shall be made: *Provided, however*, That upon request of such majority vote the Secretary of Agriculture may provide for such selection otherwise than by a meeting of the several commissioners entitled to make such selection.

In the operation of such exchange the Secretary of Agriculture, as far as practicable, shall cooperate with the several States and the various agencies therein which may be utilized and may formulate plans and regulations for exchange of service between them and such exchange.

It shall be the duty of each of the departments of the Government to furnish the Secretary of Agriculture with such statistics and data as may be acquired which would be useful in the operation of such exchange and to render such other service in the sale and distribution of farm products through such exchange as it would be practicable to render.

The Secretary of Agriculture, as rapidly as possible, shall provide standards as to quality, and, where practicable, as to containers of agricultural products not heretofore standardized and subject to subsequent standardization by Congress.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall keep advised as nearly as practicable of the details of the quantity, quality, location, and price at which held of agricultural products and the volume and location or demand in the United States and abroad and the price at which such products may be sold, and shall make such information available to producers and purchasers of such products and to the general public and shall endeavor to bring about such system in the sale and distribution of farm products as shall eliminate the waste and extremes in prices resulting from the present lack of system therein and from the undue influence of price manipulation in relation thereto.

Those desiring to offer products for sale through such exchange may do so by grade or by sample, delivered to such exchange under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe. Those desiring to purchase farm products may in like manner submit offers to purchase, and it shall be the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture to endeavor to establish trading relationship between those desiring to purchase and those desiring to sell and to procure the transfer of title and possession under such sales as may be effected at points along the natural line of movement of farm products moving to points of consumption and to direct such movement so that such products shall move as nearly as practicable from the first point of concentration to the point of ultimate need by the shortest and most economical route and in quantity and quality in accord therewith. And to this end may designate points for inspection and of delivery, and shall exercise such intermediary inspection and supervision of delivery as shall inspire general confidence in the integrity of transactions consummated through such exchanges.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to require such deposits in money, such bonds, or other guaranties of compliance with the obligation to deliver according to tender, or to receive and pay according to offer, as in his judgment may be necessary to insure compliance with the contracts made through such exchange.

All information furnished by such exchange shall not be at a higher cost than that necessary to pay the expenses of transmission.

No charges shall be made to individual producers or to producers' organizations for services rendered in effecting sales of products grown by them or by their members, as the case may be.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish such additional rules and regulations governing transactions through such exchange and the service rendered by such exchange as in his discretion may be deemed necessary.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for enforcing the provisions of the migratory-bird treaty act of July 3, 1918 (Public, No. 186, 65th Cong.), and for cooperation with local authorities in the connection of migratory birds, and for necessary investigations connected therewith, \$147,000: *Provided*, That of this sum not more than \$22,000 may be used for the enforcement of sections 241, 242, 243, and 244 of the act approved March 4, 1909, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," and for the enforcement of section 1 of the act approved May 25, 1900, entitled "An act to enlarge the powers of the Department of Agriculture, prohibit the transportation by interstate commerce of game killed in violation of local laws, and for other purposes," including all necessary investigations in connection therewith.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee with reference to this paragraph which carries an appropriation of \$147,000 for the purpose of enforcing the migratory game law, whether anyone has ever been convicted under the provisions of that law?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not know about that. Of course the Supreme Court has dismissed the case which came to it from one of the lower courts on the migratory game law itself. This is the first time that we have appropriated anything for the purpose of enforcing the migratory game treaty provision. I did not make any inquiry about it. There have been convictions, because these cases have come to the Supreme Court.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The statement of the gentleman leads to another inquiry. I have not followed the recent decisions of



the Supreme Court on this subject. The gentleman's statement that an appeal from the Supreme Court was dismissed does not tell me whether the court held the law valid or invalid.

Mr. LEVER. The Supreme Court did not pass on that, as the law had been superseded by another.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. As far as I know, the lower courts have uniformly held the law to be invalid.

Mr. LEVER. I think there was a conflict there. One court held it valid and another invalid. I think there has been a conflict as to that, but not on this proposition. Of course that was the migratory game law, and not the migratory game treaty for which this item provides.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, this is for the purpose of enforcing the law, as I understand, which was passed for the purpose of carrying out this treaty?

Mr. LEVER. That is true. The enforcement of this act will not begin until the next fiscal year.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Very true; but they have been trying to enforce this same law—well, not the same law but a similar law?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. They have been enforcing the law which Congress passed and which one of the lower courts held to be unconstitutional and another court to be constitutional. One case finally came to the Supreme Court, but the migratory bird treaty was entered into, so the Supreme Court dismissed the case.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. All I care to say in this connection is it is an utter waste of money, because nothing is accomplished by it.

Mr. PLATT. The gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inquire of the gentleman what is purposed in the expenditure of this large appropriation of \$147,000 for the enforcement of the provisions of the migratory bird treaty with Great Britain?

Mr. LEVER. Seventy-five thousand dollars of that will be used for that purpose.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is purposed in the minutia of the enforcement of that treaty? Is it intended to employ game wardens throughout the entire country?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. And under the guise of this treaty try to enforce the migratory bird law?

Mr. LEVER. Exactly. This will enable them to employ more game wardens than they have had under the old law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the former law we only appropriated something like \$50,000.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; we increase it \$25,000.

Mr. RUBEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will yield to the gentleman for further information.

Mr. RUBEN. The department have always asked a larger sum than we have allowed. A year ago they asked for \$100,000 for the enforcement of the law, and the committee or the House, I forget which, cut it down to \$50,000. They have always asked for a larger appropriation than we have allowed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman give any information as to what is planned by the department in the enforcement of the law under the guise of this treaty?

Mr. LEVER. As I understand it, they intend simply to increase their force of game wardens and pursue the same policy of enforcing this act as they have been doing in reference to the act under which a case was dismissed by the Supreme Court.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Missouri says that the department has heretofore requested a much larger amount than was granted.

Mr. LEVER. That is true.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the department requested a larger amount this year for the enforcement of the treaty?

Mr. LEVER. The department asked for an appropriation of \$125,000 for that purpose, and we gave \$75,000. We cut it \$50,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. CURRY of California. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the section; it is subject to the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, it is not subject to the point of order; it is existing law.

Mr. CURRY of California. It is existing law?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. CURRY of California. Then, I move to strike out the section.

Mr. LEVER. And upon that I ask that all debate close in six minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in six minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, make it 10 minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will make it 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CURRY of California. Mr. Chairman, I do not care about taking up the time of the committee so late this afternoon on a matter of this kind. Every person understands the section, what it refers to, why it is there, and why it ought not to be there. They are opposed to it or else they are in favor of it. I think a mistake was made in approving the treaty between Great Britain and the United States in reference to birds that migrate between Canada and this country. It has not resulted in any good, but it has resulted in bad local conditions.

Birds do the farmer some good, or at least the insectivorous birds do; but most of them are not migratory or do not migrate between Canada and the United States. Birds also do the farmer much harm. They carry and spread wheat smut, citrus canker and scale, pear blight, and domestic animal diseases.

In the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys in California wild ducks and geese destroy millions of dollars worth of grain, particularly wheat and rice. The Secretary of Agriculture, on application, may issue licenses to farmers injured by wild birds to shoot them on his farm or ranch, but the farmer is prohibited from selling, giving away, or transporting the birds they shoot. The result is that millions of ducks and geese rot on the ground of the ranches where they are shot.

The States themselves are in a better position to legislate on migratory birds and as to the time of the open and closed season than this Congress is. The California game laws protect all wild birds, except game birds, during the open season; that is, the killing of all birds except game birds named in the act is prohibited all the time and game birds can only be shot during the open season. Giving Congress the right to enact game laws is a centralization of power that is unwarranted and that a few years ago would not have been attempted. This treaty, never should have been ratified in the first place. It has been adopted, and it was done for two purposes only—one to protect the game for the gentlemen sportsmen from the cities and the other was a surrender to the theorists and idealists of the Audubon Society. They both worked together and they worked this proposition through Congress. It is not in the interest of the people at all. It is only in the interest of a theory and idea and in the interest of the rich man in large cities who can afford to own preserves and employ men to go out there and stock the preserves with feed for the game. It is not in the interest of the public. Therefore I have made the motion to strike out the section.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I disagree entirely with the gentleman from California. The States are absolutely not in a position to legislate in regard to migratory birds, and neither is one country alone. The great migratory game birds, like the ducks and the geese, as I have said before on several occasions, do not belong to this country. If a person lives where his home is, then the ducks, most of them, live really in Canada. That is where they raise their young. They come down into the United States and spend the winter, just like our rich people go to Florida or to California.

Mr. CURRY of California. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. PLATT. But the ducks and geese are a comparatively small part of the birds which are protected by the treaty. There are hundreds of varieties, or at least something over 100 species, of migratory birds that are small and that are of great economic use in destroying insects. And many of those birds nest in Canada. Many simply pass through the United States and go way down to South America in winter, some as far as Brazil and the Argentine.

I have already spoken several times on the subject of migratory birds, and I do not want to take up too much of the time of the House on that subject. Migratory birds rest sometimes only over a day or a night in a State, or they fly to it and perhaps spend a few weeks there. I have amused myself every spring by going out into the woods and fields with members of the Audubon Society and others in order to see how many birds I could identify. There are some that pass through rapidly. If you do not happen to see them in a certain week in April or May, you are not likely to see them during the whole year, unless you catch them on their return in the fall, when they are silent and do not sing and are generally harder to identify.

Mr. CURRY of California. Does not the gentleman know that more ducks and geese nest in California and Oregon than in Canada, and that the ducks and geese destroy millions of dollars' worth of cereals—wheat and rye—in that State, and that while the farmers are permitted to kill the ducks, if possible, to keep them off their ranches, they are not permitted to sell or give away or transport them? And there are millions upon millions of ducks and geese in the State of California that are killed and allowed to lie right on the ground simply on account of this law.

Mr. PLATT. If they are allowed to kill them they should be allowed to dispose of them. There are ducks and geese that nest in this country. But the great bulk of migratory ducks and geese to-day nest in Canada and along the northern border of the United States. A few species are nearly entirely resident in the United States. But the mallards and the canvasbacks and the most of the ducks that we see down here on the Potomac nest in Canada.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman has made a study of this subject and is much better informed than I am; but I had supposed that every State in the Union forbade the killing of song and insectivorous birds, and that there was not any necessity of further legislation on that subject. I do not understand that the national game wardens pay any attention to that part of the law.

Mr. PLATT. The gentleman is mistaken. For instance, take the bobolink. The bird we call the bobolink in the North, where he nests, is a rather famous song bird. After the nesting season he migrates down here into Maryland and Virginia and changes his plumage, and in the fall of the year is called a "reed bird." Then he looks entirely different, and before the Lacey Act was passed thousands of reed birds used to be shot by pot hunters to be served on our tables here in Washington and elsewhere. "Reed birds on toast" were to be found in every high-priced restaurant. The States did not generally prohibit the destruction of these birds, but as a rule their protection was made effective through the enforcement of the national law, at first by the Lacey Act, which has recently been superseded by the migratory bird act. There used to be also thousands of little birds of brilliant plumage, little warblers, killed to ornament women's hats.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Certainly.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Speaking of birds being destructive of farm crops, the gentleman knows, I presume, that the authorities on that subject say that there is only one bird, the English sparrow, that does more harm than good?

Mr. PLATT. I do not know that even the English sparrow does more harm than good, though we have more of them than we need in most cities; but I understand there are certain species of hawks that do more harm than good. It has been conclusively shown, however, that most hawks do more good than harm. You will find down in the Biological Survey of the Department of Agriculture there are experts who spend all their time examining through microscopes the contents of the stomachs of birds. These men can determine what kind of a caterpillar a bird has been eating; and they can make a pretty close estimate of how many worms or bugs in a day or in a year a certain kind of bird eats, and how many seeds of a certain kind a bird has been eating, and so can determine pretty clearly whether it does good and how much good it does.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. Referring to the destructiveness on the part of birds of agricultural products, has the gentleman any knowledge of how much the birds save by their destruction of insects and other pests which afflict vegetation?

Mr. PLATT. I have seen various estimates. They certainly save millions and millions of dollars' worth.

Mr. FESS. More than they destroy?

Mr. PLATT. Yes; vastly more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. CURRY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### DIVISION OF PUBLICATIONS.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. STAFFORD. The next paragraph will provoke some discussion, and I would suggest to the gentleman from South Caro-

lina that, having covered two-thirds of the bill, it might be an opportune place for the committee to rise.

Mr. LEVER. I will be very glad to make the motion to rise. The committee has been very kind, and there is a prospect that we can get through to-morrow. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 15018) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### HOUS OF MEETING TO-MORROW—11 O'CLOCK A. M.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. WINGO, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for the day on account of illness.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, pursuant to the order made, until to-morrow, Friday, January 31, 1919, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required to complete the pending purchase of land for the Bureau of Standards (H. Doc. No. 1744); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of expenditures on account of appropriation for contingent expenses of the War Department during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1745); to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting list of extensions of Federal buildings which have been authorized by Congress but have not so far been constructed (H. Doc. No. 1746); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CLARK of Florida, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6019) to credit and pay to the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia all moneys collected under the direct tax levied by the acts of Congress approved July 1, 1862, March 7, 1864, July 13, 1866, and March 2, 1867, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1017), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. EAGLE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 179) authorizing national banks to subscribe to the United War Work campaign, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1018), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 15386) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Neoga Township High School, Neoga, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs,



Also, a bill (H. R. 15387) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hoopston, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15388) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Manteno, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROWLAND: A bill (H. R. 15389) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of State College, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15390) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Osceola Mills, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 15391) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the E. D. Sharp Post, No. 267, Grand Army of the Republic for the E. D. Sharp soldiers' plot in the cemetery at Rimersburg, Clarion County, Pa., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 15392) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and cannon balls, to the village of Johnstown, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15393) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and cannon balls, to the city of Mount Vernon, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15394) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and cannon balls, to the city of Mansfield, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15395) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and cannon balls, to the city of Delaware, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15396) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and cannon balls, to the city of Coshocton, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15397) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and cannon balls, to the city of Ashland, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15398) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and cannon balls, to the Grand Army of the Republic Club at the city of Newark, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 15399) to regulate the sale of stock of private corporations in States or Territories of the United States other than those in which such concerns are incorporated, and to regulate the sale of lots by oil, mining, gas, or township corporations in States other than those in which such concerns are incorporated and providing that such corporations shall secure a permit from the Federal Trade Commission, and providing a penalty against the organizers, agents, and representatives violating the provisions of this act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 15400) to create a department of education, to authorize appropriations for the conduct of said department, to authorize the appropriation of money to encourage the States in the promotion and support of education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 15401) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building and site at San Luis Obispo, Cal., to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 15402) to promote the education of native illiterates, of persons unable to understand and use the English language, and of other resident persons of foreign birth; to provide for cooperation with the States in the education of such persons in the English language, the fundamental principles of government and citizenship, the elements of knowledge pertaining to self-support and home making, and in such other work as will assist in preparing such illiterates and foreign-born persons for successful living and intelligent American citizenship; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 15403) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wyoming, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEHOE: A bill (H. R. 15404) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Marianna, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15405) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Apalachicola, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15406) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a customhouse and post-office building at St. Andrews, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 15407) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of St.

Joseph, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 15408) to make additions, extensions, and improvements to the post-office building at Vincennes, Ind., to be used for post-office and mine-rescue purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15409) for the erection of a public building at Linton, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 15410) to provide for the acquisition, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of a site for a public building at Sanford, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15411) to provide for the acquisition, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of a site for a public building at Hamlet, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15412) to increase the limit of cost of a public building at Thomasville, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15413) to provide for the erection of a public building at Wadesboro, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 15414) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Dexter, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 15415) to provide for the erection of a post-office building at Lebanon, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15416) to provide for the erection of a post-office building at Noblesville, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15417) to provide for the erection of a post-office building at Tipton, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 15418) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Athens, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15419) to increase the limit of cost of a public building at Decatur, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15420) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Sheffield, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HERSEY: A bill (H. R. 15421) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Milo, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD: A bill (H. R. 15422) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at San Benito, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15423) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a Federal building at Alvin, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PHELAN: A bill (H. R. 15424) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lawrence, Mass., one German cannon or field gun and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15425) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lynn, Mass., one German field gun and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15426) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Peabody, Mass., one German cannon or field gun and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15427) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of North Reading, Mass., one German cannon or field gun and carriage; to the committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHALEY: A bill (H. R. 15428) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Summerville, Dorchester County, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15429) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Walterboro, Colleton County, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15430) for the purchase of a site for a public building at St. George, Dorchester County, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15431) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Manning, Clarendon County, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 15432) for the purchase of a post-office site at Dickson, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15433) for the purchase of a post-office site at Lawrenceburg, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: A bill (H. R. 15434) to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise additional land for the Federal building at Manchester, N. H., and to construct an addition thereon; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 15435) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to withhold temporarily Federal aid to States for the construction of post roads under certain conditions; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 15436) for the erection of a public building at El Dorado, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15437) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Warren, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15438) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Prescott, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HERSEY: A bill (H. R. 15439) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Dexter, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 15440) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Somerset, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DIXON: A bill (H. R. 15441) for the erection of a public building at Greensburg, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 15442) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal Building at Shelbyville, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOLLAND: A bill (H. R. 15443) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire, by condemnation or otherwise, such additional land in the city of Norfolk, Va., as may be necessary for the enlargement of the post-office building in said city, to cause said building to be enlarged, and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 15444) to appropriate additional money to build an addition for the increase of postal facilities at the present post office at Decatur, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 15445) to enlarge the post-office building at Fort Wayne, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 15446) to provide for the purchase of a site for a public building at Columbia, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 15447) to require publicity in prospectuses, advertisements, and offers for sale of securities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELLING: A bill (H. R. 15448) for the purchase of a post-office site at Tremonton, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15449) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at St. George, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15450) for the purchase of a post-office site at Cedar City, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15451) for the purchase of a post-office site at Mount Pleasant, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 15452) granting public lands to the State of Arizona for the construction, repair, and maintenance of public roads and highways; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 15453) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wellsville, Mo., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: A bill (H. R. 15454) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate a captured German cannon or fieldpiece to the town of Luzerne, in the State of New York; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15455) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate a captured German cannon or fieldpiece to the city of Glens Falls, in the State of New York; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15456) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate a captured German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Ballston Spa, in the State of New York; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURNETT: Resolution (H. Res. 538) providing for the consideration of House bill 15302; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KNUTSON: Resolution (H. Res. 539) authorizing the appointment of a select committee to investigate charges made against the management of the St. Elizabeths Hospital; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CANTRILL: Resolution (H. Res. 540) authorizing the payment of \$1,200 to G. D. Ellis for extra and expert services rendered in the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives during the second and third sessions of the Sixty-fifth Congress; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 401) to express the opinion of the Congress of the United States in reference to continued expenditures of public money heretofore appropriated for the construction of military camps and cantonments during time of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama praying Congress to retain the training in the use of small arms and tanks at Fort Benning in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 15457) for the relief of certain officers and members of the crew of the U. S. S. *San Diego*; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 15458) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: A bill (H. R. 15459) for the relief of Glens Falls Pharmaceutical Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 15460) granting a pension to John Bohntinsky; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 15461) granting a pension to Willie E. Vaughan; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BURROUGHS: Petition of Mrs. T. E. Ingalls, of Manchester, N. H., for the repeal of the postal zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of L. B. Ackerman and M. M. Ackerman, of Derry, N. H., for the repeal of the postal zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rev. D. P. Ganie, pastor first Baptist Church, Keene, N. H., for the repeal of the postal zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Benjamin A. Nelson and three others, of Keene, N. H., for the repeal of the postal zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rev. B. J. Glazier, pastor Advent Christian Church, Northwood Narrows, N. H., for the repeal of the postal zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of H. J. Farnham and four others, of Derry, N. H., for the repeal of the postal zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Walter H. Lewis and three others, of Manchester, N. H., for the repeal of the postal zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charles H. Perkins and W. L. Woodworth, of Lakeport, and Albert C. Moore, of Laconia, all in the State of New Hampshire, for the repeal of the postal zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Draftsmen's Union, Local No. 15767, Portsmouth, N. H., signed by W. B. Collier, recording secretary, and 17 others, for the repeal of the postal zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mrs. Alice A. Haynes and 13 other residents of Pittsburg, N. H., for the repeal of the postal zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Bluemound Country Club, protesting against the proposed raise in war tax on club dues; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rotary Club of Milwaukee, Wis., approving of the change of the name of the Panama Canal to Roosevelt Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the proposition of converting a portion of the T. N. T. plant at Ives, Wis., into a "zoological garden," and asking an investigation of status of said property; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.



Also, petition of Reel Quality Shop, of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: Petition of citizens of State of Ohio urging national ownership and government of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAGO: Petition of Philadelphia Produce Exchange favoring the determination by Congress of the scope of the work to be done by the Bureau of Markets, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Rotary Club, of New Castle, Pa., favoring continuation of Federal control of wire systems until Congress shall have studied the question further; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Wisconsin State legislative board of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, of Milwaukee, demanding new trial for Thomas J. Mooney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of legislative boards of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen and Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen of Wisconsin, opposing General Order No. 42, which denies to railroad employees their constitutional rights; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HERSEY: Petition of Britton Leather Co., Brewer, Me., urging repeal of the periodical postage amendment to revenue law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of Oscar Marietta and 10 other residents of Salem, Ohio, asking for repeal of postal zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Northern California Hotel Association, urging the return of the railroads to private ownership; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, protesting against Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KINKAID: Petition of P. E. Fitzgerald and others of Pleasanton, Nebr., asking repeal of postal zone law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mrs. Dema Marsh and citizens of Westerville and Arcadia, Nebr., asking for repeal of postal zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. L. D. Palmer, of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring repeal of the postal zone rate provision; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANSFIELD: Petition of Cuero Chamber of Commerce and Agriculture, Cuero, Tex., urging Congress to enact such laws that all transportation by rail or water and the wire system shall be released from Government control and returned to individual or corporate owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of the Pittsburgh Board of Trade, asking for the creation of a Federal highways commission, that the present appropriations for Federal aid to the States be continued and increased so as to keep pace with the development of the country, and that all governmental activities with respect to highways be administered by the Federal Highways Commission; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, petition of the Pittsburgh Board of Trade, urging legislation to prevent any German or Austrian reservist or any other person who was engaged in any manner in opposition to the United States and its allies returning to the United States for any purpose whatever, and that all enemy aliens be deported and forever debarred from returning to this country; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Pittsburgh Board of Trade, urging that Turkish authority should not be reestablished, and that the new Syria shall be federated union of provinces; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: Memorial of senate of State of New York, urging that Congress enact legislation giving pay bonus to men discharged from the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY: Petition of George T. Watson, Fairmont, W. Va., requesting that tax bill be kept down to \$4,000,000,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. Clyde Lewis, Grafton, W. Va., protesting against new tax bill being more than \$4,000,000,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of L. B. Brydon, Grafton, W. Va., requesting that tax issue be kept down to \$4,000,000,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NOLAN: Petition of San Francisco Chamber of Commerce and the Northern California Hotel Association, favoring the return of the railroads to private ownership; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POLK: Petition of Local Lodge, No. 441, International Brotherhood of Boiler Makers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers of America, approving of Government ownership of railroads in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Northern California Hotel Association, urging the return of the railroads to private ownership; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, favoring the return of railroads to private ownership; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of California Federation of Women's Clubs, indorsing the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Mississippi Valley Association, for the development of foreign and domestic trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of Central Labor Council of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against construction of vessels for the United States Shipping Board in Japanese and Chinese ports by Asiatic labor and the consequent increase of unemployment in the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STRONG: Petition of citizens of Brookville, Pa., favoring Government ownership of railroads within the United States and its possessions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of members of St. Nicholas Church, Mayport, R. F. D., Clarion County, Pa., favoring self-determination for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of citizens of Cimarron, Colo., asking for Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Local Lodge No. 406 of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Colorado Springs, Colo., urging Government control of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, January 31, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come to Thee, the Changeless One, in whom there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning. Our little systems have their day. They have their day and cease to be. Thy law standeth sure unto all generations. Thy will concerning men is their happiness, their prosperity, and their peace. We worship Thee and put ourselves under Thy divine command. We pray Thee to direct us in the discharge of all the sacred duties of this high and holy office. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Tuesday, January 28, 1919, when, on request of Mr. SHEPPARD and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

SENATOR FROM WEST VIRGINIA.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I present the credentials of Hon. DAVIS ELKINS, chosen by the qualified electors of the State of West Virginia a Senator to represent that State for the term of six years beginning on the 4th day of March, 1919, which I ask to have read and placed on the files of the Senate.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on the files, as follows:

THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA.

To all to whom these presents shall come:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November, 1918, DAVIS ELKINS, of the county of Monongalia, was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of West Virginia a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years beginning on the 4th day of March, 1919.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the said State of West Virginia this 17th day of January, 1919.

JOHN J. CORNWELL, Governor.

By the governor:  
[SEAL.]

HOUSTON G. YOUNG,  
Secretary of State.

WAR EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT SERVICE (S. DOC. NO. 365).

THE VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of Labor, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$2,932,849.53 required by the War Emergency Employment Service for the fiscal year 1919, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.